Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-AOU-034

J. Reginald Mitchell, O.P.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS

A Rational Exposition and Defense of the Catholic Religion

BY

REV. W. DEVIVIER, S.J.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL FRENCH WORK,
EDITED AND AUGMENTED

BY

REV. JOSEPH C. SASIA, S.J.
Author of "THE FUTURE LIFE"

TWO VOLUMES

NEW, EXTENSIVELY IMPROVED EDITION

VOL. II

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

NEW YORK
JOSEPH F. WAGNER, INC.
LONDON: B. HERDER

751
55
124
.2

Nihil Obstat:

PATRITIUS J. FOOTE, S.J.,
Censor Deputatus

Imprimi Potest:

JOSEPH M. PIET, S.J.,
Præp. Prov. Californiæ

Imprimatur:

PATRITIUS L. RYAN
Vicarius Generalis

ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
AUGUST 16, 1924.

Copyright, 1924, by JOSEPH F. WAGNER, New York

GOD

THE HUMAN SOUL

RELIGION

CHRISTIANITY

CATHOLICISM

Au. 5300

To

AMERICAN CATHOLIC YOUTH

ANXIOUS TO PRESERVE INTACT

THEIR GREATEST SPIRITUAL TREASURE,

CATHOLIC FAITH,

AND TO KNOW HOW TO SUCCESSFULLY DEFEND IT,

THIS WORK AS A GUIDE AND HELP

IN THEIR STUDY OF RELIGION

IS AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED

BY THE EDITOR

Roman Approval of "Christian Apologetics."

Letter of Cardinal Secretary of State.

ROME, January 13, 1904

REV. JOSEPH C. SASIA, S.J.,

Reverend Father:

With pleasure I hastened to place in the venerable hands of the Holy Father the work of Devivier's "Christian Apologetics," edited by your Reverence in the English language. His Holiness received the gift with feelings of deep satisfaction, congratulating you for having dedicated your talent to make better and better known, and to spread more and more the truths and beauties of the Catholic Religion.

He expressed the earnest hope that the work you published may produce most abundant fruits, particularly among the people of the American Commonwealth, and thus lead an ever increasing number of souls to the true love and the true Faith of Jesus Christ. And with a view that the good wishes of His Holiness may be fully realized, and you may have a pledge of the special benevolence that he cherishes in your regard, he imparts to you his apostolic benediction.

As to myself, whilst thanking your Reverence most cordially for the copy you presented to me, I cheerfully profit by this occasion to declare myself with sentiments of particular esteem,

Yours truly in our Lord,
R. CARDINAL MERRY DEL VAL.

The above is a faithful translation of the Italian original submitted to me.

P. W. RIORDAN,
Archbishop of San Francisco.

February 8, 1904.

FOREWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of this work, comprising five thousand copies, printed in San Jose, California, by the Popp and Hogan Publishing Company, in 1903, having been for some years exhausted, a new issue is published in compliance with numerous requests received by the editor from prominent Catholic Educators and from Rectors of Seminaries, Colleges and Academies in the United States and elsewhere. As indicated on the title page, the book is a translation of the COURS APOLOGÉTIQUE of Father Devivier, S.J., which met with a noteworthy success in both Belgium and France, as it reached its twentieth edition within the space of a few years. It was approved and highly praised by six Cardinals, thirty-two Archbishops and Bishops, and by the Catholic Press of both countries.

The present English translation made from the sixteenth edition of the French original has been likewise well received by the general public and particularly by the members of the Catholic Hierarchy of the United States, as is evidenced by the letters addressed to the Editor by five Archbishops and by fifteen Bishops. Several Catholic Publications in this country, in England, Ireland and Canada have made very favorable criticisms and have recommended the Course as a suitable Text-book for use in our Catholic Colleges and Universities. But a most agreeable surprise was the receipt of a letter from His Eminence, Cardinal Merry del Val, addressed to the Editor, January 13, 1904, by order of His Holiness, P. Pius X, *felicis memoriæ*. The letter appears in this new edition.

The work is intended primarily for the general reader and has not been written exclusively as a Text-book in Evidences of Religion for upper-class students in our Catholic Institutions. It may, however, be adapted to such purpose as a four-year Course in the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior and Senior College-classes. In this case, the Deans of Studies, in apportioning matter to the respective classes, will not follow

the logical order of the successive Chapters of the two Volumes, but rather the order of the students' mental development. Hence, Parts First and Second should be reserved to students in Philosophy, as they will find in them matters analogous to the subjects which they are studying for their Collegiate degrees. The remaining Parts may be distributed among the other classes, according to the judgment of the College Officials.

As nearly every thesis is supplied with abundant matter for its demonstration, it will be the Teacher's task to determine and specify what is required for recitation in his class, and what may be assigned as supplementary reading matter for private study.

Following the suggestion of competent authorities, I have made each of the two volumes a work complete in itself, as far as subject-matters treated are concerned: each volume having its own table of contents at the beginning and its own alphabetical index of subjects at the end.

The Alphabetical Index of all the writers quoted throughout this Course will be given at the end of Volume II.

With regard to the References quoted in this work from non-Catholic authors, it is understood that, in citing them, we intend to endorse their thoughts and arguments only so far as they are found to agree with the doctrine stated in our text. Such works have been consulted to ascertain the opinions of our opponents with a view to furnish to our readers the refutation of teachings opposed to the doctrine expounded and defended in this Apologetic Course.

It is sincerely hoped that this new and copiously augmented edition of CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS will be of help both to the general reader and to our Catholic Youth—to whom it is dedicated—in acquiring a reliable and thorough information of the fundamental principles of their holy Religion, to the end that their defense of it may be both intelligent, courageous and successful.

JOSEPH C. SASIA, S.J.

University of Santa Clara,
Santa Clara, California.
September 5, 1924.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

When we undertake to establish the reality of the supernatural Revelation, and the divine institution of the Roman Catholic Church, we have a right to presuppose in our demonstration several other truths or principles pertaining to the scientific or philosophical order. Nevertheless, competent judges have advised us that in our days it is supremely important to present to Catholic youths a summary or abridgment of the most fundamental preliminaries, such as the proofs of the existence and attributes of God, and of the spirituality and immortality of the human soul, theologically called *Præambula Fidei* (paving the way to Faith).

The existence of God, first of all; for Atheism, cried down and refuted long ago as a mental monstrosity, is again rampant, and proudly boasts of being the latest conquest of modern science. Science, after having solemnly protested that it based its conclusions *solely* upon *experience*, and that *experiment* has nothing to do with the questions of the *origin* and essence or nature of things (Littré); that it did not concern itself either about the *first causes* of beings, or about *their end* or purpose (Berthelot); yet, strange to say, this same science claims to have disproved, it would seem, the very existence of the First Cause! The progress of chemistry, physics, astronomy appears to have demonstrated the uselessness of a Creator!

Samuel Wainwright, in his excellent book entitled "Scientific Sophisms," reproduces the verdict of modern infidel sciences in the following words (ch. 1, pp. 1–2):

"God created man? No such thing. The *monads* developed him. The heavens declare the glory of God? Far from it, they declare only the glory of the *astronomer*. We have now no need of the hypothesis of God. The divine existence

is now declared to be not only unnecessary; it is absolutely unreal; it is the creature of the human imagination." The hand may well tremble that writes it, and the ears may tingle that hear it, yet it has been both written and said.

Beside this shocking denial, and what is more perfidious still, doubt, we find that in this century of ours even the most evident truths have been obscured, and the most solid convictions, in a great measure, shaken up or even entirely uprooted. After hearing men of incontestable ability often proclaiming that reason is unable to demonstrate the foundations of Faith; after hearing it repeatedly stated that it is impossible to prove the existence of God, the divinity of Christ or the immortality of man's soul, it is but natural to expect that our youth will ask with some kind of uneasiness, if it be really true that he believes in God without any rational or reasonable motive. And if his faith should still remain unshaken, will he not see himself reduced to the position of opposing to these sophisms a conviction, sincere, no doubt, but one of which he only too vaguely possesses the basis? We do not hesitate to say: That the young Christian owes it to himself, he owes it to his weaker brethren, to be able to demonstrate in a triumphant manner this truth of primary importance, *that reason honestly consulted never fails to lead to the belief and acceptance of revealed Faith.* As we shall show further on (nn. 141, 142 of Part III), when treating of the function of reason in matters of faith, faith presupposes a *rational knowledge* of God; to believe it is necessary to know beforehand that God exists. But it may be said, what use is there of entering into the difficult path of a scientific demonstration? Does not God manifest Himself clearly enough by the voice of conscience, by the marvels of His works? Most certainly, there is nothing easier than the reasoning which shows to the upright and sincere soul the existence of God. But the imperfect knowledge which suffices for the masses is one thing and the profound knowledge reserved for the high intellects is quite another.

Happy are they who have the will and the leisure to cultivate and to attain it! The pleasure of the mind consists in the

contemplation of the truth; and this pleasure is all the greater in proportion as the truth thus contemplated is more sublime or more important and shines with greater brilliancy. Now, the aim of the study, which we are about to undertake, is precisely to show forth the greatest of all truths: the existence of God, the first Cause and the first purpose or end of all things. Next to the existence of God comes the discussion on the human soul, its Liberty, Spirituality and Immortality. The wide spreading in our days of the doctrines of *Determinism* and *Materialism* cannot be denied, and it is well known with what audacity those abominable systems also shelter themselves under the mantle and prestige of modern science.

But it would be of little value to prove the existence of a Supreme Being, if it all ended in mere Theism. The true idea or conception of God is constantly attacked, changed, perverted by a multitude of writers, who vie with each other in proclaiming their so-called religious impressions, who acclaim God in prose and verse. A kind of religious sentimentalism, vague and false, poisons a certain class of spiritualistic literature. Has there not been found many a pantheistic formula in the works of our most celebrated poets? In all probability the writer (A. Nettement) was not exaggerating who called "*pantheism* the seducer of the highest intellects of our times." Deistic philosophy, a press indifferent to religion, the diffusion of atheistic scientific theories, everything conspires to falsify the true notion and idea of God. This is why there exists an urgent necessity to put this idea in its true light.

We need not here dwell on the paramount importance of the questions we are about to treat, for it is self-evident. Indeed, of all the truths that may interest the curiosity of man and attract his undivided attention, the most weighty, the most fundamental is, no doubt, the existence of God. Upon it rests the whole edifice of religion, which is the study of man's relations to his Creator. The great enigma of man's destiny here and hereafter can be deciphered only by the light of that master truth; and blind is that science that does not recognize in nature the vestiges of its Author. "*All men are*

vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God.'' (Wisdom, 13, 1.)

It is in vain that a certain school of philosophy strives to make progress consist in a haughty contempt of what they are pleased to style a *chimera.* But such an attitude of supreme indifference will not prevent thinking men from addressing to themselves the awful inquiry: ''Whence do I come? Whither am I going? Have I a Master over me? Have I a judge, to whom I am accountable?''

And what about our soul, its nature, its origin, its destiny? Man's life changes character and significance according as it is considered simply as a chance succession of mechanical phenomena, ending in nothingness, or as a place of temporary probation, where man by the exercise of good works secures to himself the possession of a happiness that shall never end.

Man is truly the masterpiece of creation. In classic language, man's body is a veritable *microcosm*—a little world—a world in miniature. His soul, ''that vital spark of heavenly flame,'' is in itself as enduring as the omnipotent power that brought it into existence. His mental faculties, intellect, memory and will are an image of the august Trinity; a mirror, a reflection of the uncreated beauty, wisdom and perfection of the Godhead. In the language of St. Gregory the Great, man contains in himself an abridgment, a summary of all the wonders scattered throughout the realm of creation by God's munificent hand. In fact, he shares existence with the minerals, growth with plants, sensibility with animals, intelligence with the angels, and immortality with God. Hence the greatest of English poets could truly exclaim:

> ''What a piece of work is a man!
> How noble in reason, how infinite in faculties!
> In action how like an angel!
> In apprehension how like a god!
> The beauty of the world, the paragon of animals!''
> —*Hamlet, Act II, sc. 2.*

This being so noble, so lofty, so wonderful, as the experience of sixty centuries teaches us, and our own testimony

assures us, this being, I say, soon disappears from the theatre of this world to return no more. Is there a destiny awaiting him beyond the grave?

Or must he utterly perish like the trees of the forest, the birds of the air and the beasts of the field? Was his existence, so ennobled by the lavish profusion of divine gifts, was it to be limited to the narrow horizon of the present life, or is it to be extended to the shoreless ocean of the eternal years? Though limited in his nature and finite in his faculties, man possesses nevertheless an intellect, whose capacity no earthly knowledge can fill; he possesses a heart, whose aspirations no temporal good can completely gratify. What then shall be the perfect object of his knowledge? What shall be the centre of his love? To answer these questions is to solve the problem of life.

If it be the most sacred and peremptory duty of man to propose to himself the question regarding his destiny in the future world, it is likewise a matter of the greatest moment for him to know, with unerring certainty, its true answer. And it was precisely to preserve the human mind from all danger of error and deception in a point that affects our most vital interests both of time and eternity, and determines the direction of all the actions of our responsible life, it was for this object, I say, that God Himself, with a providential care, worthy of His infinite goodness and wisdom, has revealed to His intelligent creatures upon earth the true answer to that gravest of questions. As man's present destiny is entirely supernatural, viz., above and beyond the exigencies of nature, and depending on God's Free Will, it cannot be known except from God Himself, and from Him also come the supernatural means enabling us to attain it. For the means, as reason itself teaches us, must be proportionate to the end. Hence divine revelation alone can solve the problem of life, and explain the true meaning of our earthly existence; not a revelation, mind well, read by every man's whim, and tampered by every man's judgment, but a revelation interpreted and expounded by the unerring voice of the Church of Christ, the divinely appointed teacher of men, guaranteed against all error and corruption

by the infallible assurance of Him who said more than nineteen centuries ago: "*I will ask the Father and He shall give you another Paraclete, the* Spirit of truth, *that He may abide with you forever . . . When He, the* Spirit of truth, *is come, He will teach you all truth.*" (John 14, 16, 17; 16, 13.)

And, thanks to this most merciful provision, the teachers and guides, that are to lead us to the knowledge of divine truth, are not far to seek. We find them in our very midst, in the persons of the ministers of Christ, the God-sent ambassadors and successors of the Apostles, in whose possession is found the treasure of revealed Faith; the full and complete body of Christian truths, teaching man his origin, his end and the means by which to attain it. In listening to their voice we bow and submit to the voice of God Himself, speaking to men through the instrumentality of His Church; of that Church, I mean, who alone can produce before the world the credentials and testimonials of her divine mission, authorizing her to teach in the name of God as the very mouthpiece of eternal *truth;* that Church, who alone can trace back through an unbroken tradition of nineteen hundred years, in an uninterrupted line of successors, the divine commission to announce to all human generations the heavenly message of salvation brought upon earth by her Founder, the Incarnate Son of God, the Savior and Redeemer of the world; that Church in fine, who identical in every respect with that of the Apostles has never ceased to appear before men invested with the exclusive character of divine truth, sealed with the evidence of divine miracles, and stamped with the approval and testimony of God (nn. 205–214).

This Church has certainly the authority and power to speak on the *problem of life,* and if she speaks, she has undoubtedly the right to be heard. Basing then her teaching on the revealed *word* of God, embodied both in holy Scripture and Tradition, she tells us in a language which no man can mistake or misapprehend, that in accordance with the designs of Divine Providence this world, in which we dwell for a brief period of years, is but a preparation for the next, which shall last forever. Hence the present is for the future, time is for

eternity, death is the beginning of a new life, and the gloom of the grave shall one day give place to the brightness of ever enduring light. It is then from the voice, from the infallible authority of the Catholic Church that we learn the noble, lofty truth of our origin and of the high destiny that awaits us beyond the grave; a destiny so great, so precious, so sublime, that God, omnipotent as He is, could not create man for a higher object, could not make him for a nobler purpose.

Enlightened by these principles we can confidently approach the great *problem of life* and solve it in a manner completely satisfactory both to the claims of the mind, and to the aspirations of the heart. Hence each one of us can truly say to himself: God is my first beginning and my last end. A God man is my Redeemer, my Savior, my Teacher, my Model; virtue is my profession; justice is my rule of life; grace is my strength; heaven is my inheritance, eternity my expectation, my happiness, the happiness of God Himself. Therefore, in accordance with these principles, I was made not to amass earthly riches, which are perishable, not to covet earthly honors, which are fleeting, not to indulge my unruly appetites, which are degrading, in a word, I was not made to commit sin, I was not made to live in rebellion against my Creator, but I was made to serve God as His subject, to obey Him as His servant, to love Him as His child, and to possess Him as my reward. It is from the sublimity of these sentiments that man learns to appreciate his dignity and disdains to dishonor himself and his sacred character by the horrors of vice. It is by realizing these sublime truths that he fears to degrade himself by the slavery of his passions, to tarnish the beauty of his immortal soul and blight his prospects of eternal happiness by the stain of grievous sin, the consciousness of which makes the stoutest heart quiver and tremble at the portals of eternity, when man is about to appear before that Supreme Judge, from whose piercing glance nothing can escape, and from whose sentence there lies no appeal. Dear reader, let us frequently recall to our memory these lofty, elevating, sublime thoughts. They ennoble all our sentiments, they sanctify all our actions, they satisfy all our desires, they

comfort us in all our afflictions, they sustain us in all our adversities. In this point of view our soul becomes more precious than all the goods of this world; our dignity as Christians surpasses in grandeur and magnificence that of all earthly kings and potentates; and the title of immortal, reminding us of our everlasting, happy destiny, reflects on us more honor than all the diadems that have ever encircled the brow of the mightiest monarchs of the earth. It has been well said, "On earth there is nothing great but man; in man there is nothing great but the soul; in the soul there is nothing great but the grace and friendship of God, which entitle him to the possession of that bliss which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor man's heart conceived." It is the purpose of this work to exhibit and demonstrate the solid foundations, on which the sublime truths here enunciated are grounded, and thus enable the Christian reader to carry into execution the advice of the Prince of the Apostles, "*being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you.*" (I Peter, 3, 15.) May our divine Lord, for whose honor and glory these pages are written, grant that neither the logical vigor of our reasoning, nor the clearness of our exposition, shall suffer from the condensation and abridgment of our book.

THE EDITOR.

N.B.—References in parentheses are to the marginal numbers of this volume, unless otherwise indicated.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND VOLUME

What is the Christianity which has been demonstrated and defended thus far in the first volume of this Apologetic Course? It is historic Christianity, identical with the Catholic Church for the simple reason that no genuine, integral, authentic Christianity has as yet been found outside Catholicism. It is the Christianity, whose perennial, beneficent influence has been recognized by friends and foes alike on account of the vast services it rendered to mankind; the Christianity that can point to the priceless blessings it has bestowed upon humanity; to the barbarous nations it has converted and civilized; to the slavery it has gradually abolished, and to the many generations it has led to happiness here and hereafter. It is not the Christianity shivered into countless sects, but Christianity compact, coherent, consistent, full and complete in all its organs, and healthy in all its constituent parts, which, as it has resisted all its opponents in the past, so shall overcome the attacks of all its enemies in the future. The discussion we held in the preceding parts on this legitimate champion of God's revelation showed that it is supported by such an array of arguments that to reject it would be to act not only against the enlightened dictates of conscience, but also in opposition to those universally accepted maxims of prudence which should guide all reasonable men in the most weighty affairs of life. It is the Christianity that solves all difficulties, unravels all doubts, gives a lofty meaning to human life, and a most cheering illumination to the mystery of death. Lastly, by Christianity, as expressed in scientific, systematic form I mean the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, who with the most exact theological precision drew out as upon a map the dealings of God with man and the relation of man to God from the days of the First Parents

in the Garden of Eden even to that day when all mankind shall see the Judgment of God. As a skillful general, to secure victory, chooses the most experienced, formidable and courageous warriors, so the Catholic Apologist, to win success, must send forward to the forefront not a crippled, mutilated Christianity, but one that above all the rest in power, in past achievements, in intellectual and moral force, in bravery and discipline stands preëminently first. A modern unbeliever addressing an audience of infidels of the militant type gave them this advice. "Christianity exists as a power in the world, and it is important that we should realize and estimate its full strength. It is idle to waste our arguments and our sarcasms on Protestantism. If we think that Christianity is false, let us meet it and combat it in its strongest and most coherent form, that of Catholicism." With such a champion in the field we have every reason to anticipate an easy and complete victory over all the adversaries to be met with in the second volume of our Course, as we had in confounding the enemies encountered in the first.

Fully endorsing the sentiments of the distinguished writer, Father Robert Kane, S.J., in his preface to "God or Chaos," I freely admit "that my emphatic and unhesitating way of speaking does not come from any overweening trust in my own intellectual powers, but from an absolute conviction of the truth, to which I owe and render a frank and fearless allegiance. With a thorough consciousness, which I have, of the divine fullness and efficacy of my cause, it is scarcely possible that I should not speak like a soldier in the battlefield, whose sword is unsheathed and who knows that victory is on his side." As St. Augustine writes: "It is good for man that truth should conquer him willingly, for it is bad for him to be conquered by truth unwillingly. For truth must necessarily conquer him whether willing or unwilling." (Epistle 238th, ad Pascent.)

THE EDITOR.

CONTENTS

PART VI

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

CHAPTER PAGE

I. GENERAL PRELIMINARY REMARKS 1
§ 1. Object and Division of Part VI 2
§ 2. General Ideas Concerning the Church . . . 3

II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST 13

Art. 1. The Marks of the True Church of Jesus Christ . 14
I. Marks of the Church in General 14
II. Division of the Marks of the Church 16
III. Positive Marks 17
A. Unity 17
B. Sanctity 25
C. Catholicity 27
D. Apostolicity 30

The Two-fold Power of Order and Jurisdiction . . 33

Art. 2. The Roman Church Possesses the Four Positive Marks of the True Church 38
§ 1. Unity 38
Answer to Objection Raised from the Schism of the West 42
§ 2. Sanctity 47
§ 3. Catholicity 49
§ 4. Apostolicity 50

III. PROTESTANTISM DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST 54
§ 1. Protestantism is Absolutely Devoid of Unity . . 56
§ 2. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Sanctity 62
§ 3. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Catholicity 67
§ 4. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Apostolicity 68
§ 5. In its Rule of Faith Protestantism Contradicts Jesus Christ 72
Church of England's Fallacious Rule of Faith . 79
Declaration of the Catholic Bishops of Great Britain on the Teaching and Practice of the Catholic Church Regarding Holy Scripture 83

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. THE ORIENTAL SCHISMATIC CHURCH DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH . 89

Historical Notice 90

§ 1. The Greek Church Possesses Neither Unity of Belief, nor Unity of Ministry 96

§ 2. It Does Not Possess the Mark of Sanctity . . 99

§ 3. It Does Not Possess the Mark of Catholicity . 100

§ 4. It Does Not Possess the Mark of Apostolicity . 102

V. THE PRIMACY OF THE SEE OF PETER, OR THE PAPACY 109

1. Jesus Christ Conferred upon St. Peter the Primacy of Jurisdiction Over the Whole Church . . . 110

2. Jesus Christ Intended that the Primacy Should Be Transmitted to the Successors of St. Peter . . . 116

3. It is the Church of Rome that Possesses the Primacy of the See of Peter 119

Authors Consulted in Part VI 130

PART VII

OF SOME PREROGATIVES CONFERRED BY JESUS CHRIST UPON HIS CHURCH

I. THE INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE CHURCH . . . 133

II. THE AUTHORITY OR POWERS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST 137

§ 1. Power to Teach 139

§ 2. Power of Dispensing the Sacraments 143

§ 3. Power to Govern 144

III. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH 148

§ 1. Its Nature and Necessity 148

§ 2. Object of Infallibility, or Matters on which it is Exercised 158

§ 3. Subject of Infallibility, or in Whom it Resides . 161

I. Infallibility of the Teaching Church . . . 161

II. Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff . . . 162

§ 4. Conditions of Infallibility 166

IV. RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE . . 170

§ 1. Independence of the Spiritual Power 173

§ 2. Independence of the Civil Power 175

§ 3. Rights of the Church 177

Rights of the Church in Case of Conflict with Civil Rulers 178

The Church and the State Must Mutually Help Each Other 180

§ 4. The Church Owes Assistance and Protection to the State 180

§ 5. The Temporal Power in Its Turn Owes Aid and Protection to the Church 181

CHAPTER PAGE
V. LIBERALISM AND LIBERTY 185
§ 1. General Notions Concerning Liberalism . . . 185
§ 2. Modern Liberties 193
§ 3. Tolerance 200
§ 4. Considerations Concerning Liberty and Its Different Kinds 207
Authors Consulted in Part VII 217

PART VIII

OF CERTAIN ACCUSATIONS BROUGHT AGAINST THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

I. THE INTOLERANCE OF THE CHURCH 222
I. In What Sense is the Catholic Church Intolerant 222
II. Protestant Intolerance 224
III. Intolerance of the Other Enemies of the Church . 234
II. OF THE MAXIM: OUT OF THE CHURCH THERE IS NO SALVATION 236
III. THE VICIOUS CIRCLE 246
IV. THE INQUISITION 253
I. The Origin and Nature of the Ecclesiastical Inquisition 254
II. Lawfulness of the Inquisition in Principle . . 256
III. What Should Be Thought of the Proceedings of the Inquisition in General and of the Spanish Inquisition in Particular 260
V. THE PROCESS OF GALILEO 275
I. The Error Contained in the Decree of 1616 Proves Nothing Against the Infallibility of the Church, or Against the Infallibility of the Pope . . 277
II. Is the Church Opposed to Scientific Progress, and Was Galileo a Martyr to Science? 287
VI. THE MASSACRE ON THE EVE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY 293
Religion Had No Part Whatever in that Massacre . . 294
VII. THE CRUSADES 299
I. Lawfulness of the Crusades 301
II. Results of the Crusades 303
VIII. THE WARS OF RELIGION 306
IX. THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES . . 308
I. Was that Revocation Legitimate? 309
II. Was it Expedient or Opportune? 309
III. What is to Be Thought of Its Execution and Its Results? 311

CHAPTER PAGE

X. THE AUTHORITY EXERCISED BY THE POPES DURING THE MIDDLE AGES OVER THE TEMPORAL POWER OF PRINCES 313
I. The Power Exercised By the Popes During the Middle Ages Over Christian Rulers Was Perfectly Legitimate 314
II. The Popes Have Made Use of Their Right in a Manner Most Salutary to Society 320
XI. THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES 322
XII. THE BAD POPES 328
I. Can There Be Bad Popes? 329
II. In Reality Have There Been Many Bad Popes? . 330
XIII. OTHER CHARGES AND OBJECTIONS FROM NON-CATHOLICS 333
Authors Consulted in Part VIII 336

PART IX

SOME RECENT MENTAL ABERRATIONS EXPOSED AND REFUTED

I. AGNOSTICISM 339
II. FREE THOUGHT 345
III. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE 351
IV. A SAFE VIEW OF SPIRITISM FOR CATHOLICS . . 361
§ 1. Timely Importance of this Subject 361
§ 2. The True Cause or Agency of Certain Spiritistic Phenomena 366
§ 3. The Serious Religious, Mental, Moral, and Physical Dangers of Spiritism 378
V. THEOSOPHY 384
§ 1. Its Meaning and Program 384
§ 2. Some of Its Glaring Errors 385
§ 3. Illusive Promises of Theosophy 386
§ 4. Theosophic Theory on Man's Future Destiny . . 386
§ 5. Theosophy versus Catholic Dogmas 387
§ 6. Marvels of Theosophy as Its Credentials . . . 388
VI. MODERNISM 391
§ 1. Its Definition 391
§ 2. The Modernists' Program 392
§ 3. Modernism Built on False Philosophy . . . 393
§ 4. Why Modernism Has Been Condemned 395
Syllabus of Errors Condemned By the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, July 3, 1907 . . 398
tion. July 3, 1907 398
VII. HIGHER CRITICISM 406
§ 1. Its Meaning and Abuse 406
§ 2. Doings of Heterodox Higher Critics and Their Confutation 408
Authors Consulted in Part IX 415

PART X

THE CHURCH AND CIVILIZATION

CHAPTER PAGE

I. STATE OF THE PAGAN WORLD BEFORE JESUS CHRIST, OR PAGAN CIVILIZATION 420
§ 1. General View 420
§ 2. The Fate of Individuals Before the Coming of Jesus Christ 424
I. Slavery 424
II. Gladiators 426
III. The Poor and the Unfortunate 428
IV. Laborers 428
§ 3. The Family Before the Coming of Christ . . . 429
§ 4. Public Society, or the State Before the Coming of Jesus Christ, and Its Relations with Other Nations 430

II. STATE OF THE WORLD AFTER THE COMING OF JESUS CHRIST, OR CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION . 433
§ 1. General View 433
§ 2. The Condition of Individuals After the Coming of Jesus Christ 434
I. Slaves and Gladiators 434
II. The Poor and the Unfortunate 438
III. The Laborers or the Working Classes . . 439
§ 3. The Family After the Coming of Jesus Christ . 439
§ 4. Civil Society After the Coming of Jesus Christ, and Relations Between Nations 440
§ 5. Transformation of the Barbarians After the Coming of Christ 441
§ 6. Catholic and Protestant Nations 446

III. THE CHURCH AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE . . 457
§ 1. Influence of the Church On the Cultivation of Learning 457
§ 2. The Church and the Fine Arts 464
§ 3. The Church and Education 467
I. Popular Instruction 467
II. Superior and Secondary Education . . . 474
§ 4. The Church and Science 479
1. Some Distinguished Catholic Scientists . . 481
2. Universities Founded by Catholic Kings and Princes, and Often Under Immediate Papal Inspiration 482
3. Theological Studies 485

Authors Consulted in Part X 486
General Conclusion of This Work 488
Index of Subjects 493
General Index of Writers 499

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS

PART VI

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

CHAPTER I

GENERAL PRELIMINARY REMARKS

§ I. Object and Division of Part VI

1. Object. Basing our arguments upon the Old and the New Testament, historical documents of unquestionable authority, we have proven in a peremptory, decisive manner, the divinity of the Christian religion. But here we are pertinently asked, *where is true Christianity* to be found, such as it was preached and enjoined by Jesus Christ? This is the important question which we have now to solve.

The Christian religion, instituted, as it was, to be *practiced* by all men, could not exist in an abstract state. It lives in a *concrete* society bearing the name of Church, a visible society which professes the doctrine of Christ and observes His laws.

But there are many religious societies which claim to be invested with the divine mission of preserving in its entirety and full integrity the teaching of Jesus Christ and of transmitting it from age to age until the end of the world. Yet it is manifest, and we shall soon prove it, that among these manifold Churches, which differ among themselves in the articles of Faith to be believed, in the moral laws to be ob-

served, and in the worship to be practiced, *one* alone must be the true Church; the others cannot be anything else but sects repudiated by Jesus Christ, whose name they unworthily assume.

The special object of the second volume of this Course is to enable the reader to discern with certainty *the Church founded by Jesus Christ;* to show that the Roman Church, which has the Pope as her Supreme Head, has alone the right to claim our belief, our respect, our obedience and love.

Remark. We need not in this work concern ourselves about Christian communities, which have disappeared centuries ago, leaving hardly any vestiges of their existence in history. Already in his time St. Augustine counted over eighty heresies completely extinct before his day; and in the XVIth century Cardinal Bellarmine, recently beatified, after citing the names of two hundred heresies anterior to Luther added: "All these sects have perished; there is hardly to be found in the East a remnant of the Nestorians and Eutychians, and in Bohemia only a few old sectarian disciples of John Huss are known to survive." It will be easily understood that we have no object in bringing back to light these fragments of errors buried for ages in well-merited oblivion. It will suffice to compare with Catholicism the Churches which have preserved some sort of vitality, that is to say, the Protestant sects and the Schismatic Greek Churches. The triumphant conclusion derived from this parallel will apply with more reason to the other anti-Catholic sects, whatever they be.

2. Division. In the treatment of this Part VI we follow this order. In the first chapter are set down general ideas concerning the Church founded by Jesus Christ, her definition, constitution, the supposed claims of the other various communities.

In the second chapter are analyzed the marks or notes of the true Church of Christ, which are shown to be exclusively proper to the Roman Church.

The third chapter is devoted to proving that Protestantism is utterly destitute of the above-described marks.

In the fourth chapter we demonstrate that the Oriental

Schismatic Churches are likewise deprived of the aforesaid marks.

The fifth chapter lays down the arguments in favor of the primacy of the See of Peter, or the Roman Papacy.

Remarks. 1. In this part the discussion, as the reader may easily see, is placed on quite a different footing from that adopted in the first volume of this Course. There, we could suppose that we had to deal with infidels, unbelievers, rationalists, who refused to acknowledge the divinity of the mission of Jesus Christ and the obligation incumbent upon man to embrace the religion established by Him. We, therefore, used as proofs only historical documents and the truths of reason. Here, on the contrary, the discussion is engaged especially with the Greek Schismatics and conservative Protestants, who, like us, believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, and who admit the *inspiration* of the Sacred Books. Such being the case, we can bring forward as decisive arguments texts of the Old and New Testaments, *considered as the words of infallible truth.*

2. We have nothing to do here with Protestant sects that deny these two fundamental truths, the divinity of Christ and the authority of the Bible; for by so doing they forfeit all claim to be called Christians, and can be refuted, as other unbelievers, by other arguments; in fact they have already been refuted in the first volume of this work.

§ II. General Ideas Concerning the Church

3. 1. Definition of the Church. To the word *Church* (in Latin *ecclesia*—assembly) authors sometimes attribute an extended and at other times a more restricted sense. In the first sense, the Church is the union of *all the faithful servants of God* who struggle on earth, who are purified of their faults in purgatory, who triumph in heaven, including even the angels. Taken in the second acceptance of the term the Church is the assembly of the faithful *who combat on earth* (the Church militant). Taken in this second acceptation of the term, the Church may be said to comprise all the true

worshippers of God from the beginning of the world until the end of time; all of these indeed have believed or will believe in revealed religion, which is essentially the same in its three successive phases, the Primitive or Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian n. 136, vol. I). However, the name of Church is generally reserved for the *Christian* Church as it has existed in the world since the time that Jesus Christ came to give supernatural religion its highest perfection.

It is in this more restricted sense that we shall consider the Church in the present treatise. Thus understood, it may be defined: The society of the Faithful instituted by Jesus Christ to preserve His doctrine, observe His laws, and, under the authority of His Vicar and the Bishops, attain in this way and by these means the last end of man, life eternal.

As Father Patrick Murray in his classical "Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi" wisely remarks, little is to be gained by dwelling on general and inadequate definitions of the Church which our separated brethren would be willing to accept, but which fail to distinguish the Church of Christ from all heretical and schismatical bodies proscribed both by Himself and His Apostles. A correct definition must be such as to be *exclusively* applicable to the religious society, the Church, founded by the Son of God, the Savior of the world. Such is the Catholic, adequate definition given by Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J., the prince of controversialists, and approved by all subsequent theologians. It is substantially as follows:

The Church founded by Christ is rightly defined as: "The visible society of the validly baptized Faithful, united together in one organic body by the profession of the same Christian Faith, by the participation of the same seven Sacraments, and by submission to their legitimate pastors, particularly to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, Christ's representative and Vicar upon earth."

A brief analysis of the several elements constituting our definition will show that it is exclusively proper to the Roman Catholic Church, and that it consequently excludes all Christian denominations opposed to the Church of Rome.

It is a *society,* that is an assemblage of members directed

by competent authority and organized for a special end to be attained by the use of determined means.

It is a *visible* society, thus refuting the sectarian definition of the Church as the invisible society of the Elect, the Just and the Predestined.

Of the validly baptized Faithful. For Baptism, administered according to Christ's institution, is absolutely required as the means of incorporating human individuals into His Church, making them members of His mystical body and entitling them to a full share of the fruits of Redemption.

United together by the profession of the same Christian Faith, as evidenced by the mark of Unity of belief soon to be considered.

By the participation of the same seven Sacraments. The object or purpose of the Sacraments is to apply the benefits of our Savior's Redemption to human souls for their sanctification and salvation.

Here we pertinently ask: Who possessed the exclusive right of determining by what means these benefits were to reach human souls? Evidently God alone had such a power, and Christ, the Son of God, actually exercised such a right and power by the institution of the seven Sacraments, the authentic channels of divine grace, a fact clearly announced in His own words recorded in St. John's Gospel (14, 5): *"No man cometh to the Father but by me."* After this reflection we know what to think of the early Reformers who took it upon themselves to throw overboard five of the Sacraments, and to transform the Holy Eucharist into the so-called Supper of the Lord, a veritable parody and utter perversion of the holiest rite instituted by Christ on the eve of His Passion. To this sacrilegious tampering with God's work we oppose the words of our definition, "the participation of the same seven Sacraments."

By submission to their legitimate pastors, for to them alone belongs the authority to command, and they alone possess the right to be obeyed.

Who are the unlawful pastors to whom nobody is obliged to submit, we learn from Christ Himself: *"They are those*

that enter not by the door into the sheepfold, but climb up another way." (John 10, 1.) To all so-called evangelizers, who hold no divine commission, and lack jurisdiction over the flock, can be rightly applied what the Lord says of false prophets: "*I did not send them, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied.*" (Jer. 23, 21). For, two conditions are required to constitute a legitimate Christian pastor, a divine vocation and preaching God's revealed word. Without these there can be no heavenly assistance, indispensably needed to render fruitful the work of the ministry, for Christ says in His Gospel: "*Without me you can do nothing.*" (John 15, 4–5.)

By submission *particularly to the Roman Pontiff.* Here we have the infallible crucial test of the Church founded by Christ, loyalty and obedience to His Vicar, the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter. Here is the infallible line of demarcation separating all the sectarian and Schismatical Churches of the past, present and future from the Roman Catholic Church, who alone recognizes the Pope as the supreme Ruler of the whole flock of Christ. We may then logically conclude that our definition, as explained above, whilst disproving as untenable all Protestant and Schismatic claims, shows, at the same time, where the true Church of Christ is to be found.

4. 2. The Christian Religion Constitutes a True Society, a Church. Rationalists, as we have seen, do not refuse to acknowledge in Jesus Christ the ideal type of human perfection; but however pure and splendid His virtue may be, He is, in their eyes, a mere mortal, and the Christian Church and her organization are not His work; she has in common with Him nothing but *the doctrine* which she professes. But if such be the case, how did the followers of Christ succeed in forming a society, in constituting a Church? The following is the explanation which the Rationalists venture to give. Christ, according to them, aimed at nothing but the moral perfection and reform of Judaism. His disciples, constantly engaged in studying the doctrine of the Wise Man whose life and teachings they admired; accustomed, moreover, to philo-

sophical speculations and ever increasing in number, were naturally brought to form a society. For the idea of Christ and His doctrine, they substituted, step by step, that of a society formed by Him, and as they remembered the ancient glory of the Synagogue, they sheltered themselves under its shadow, until they became, they thought, strong enough to separate from it. Thus say certain Rationalists, and they hold that it was only in the second century that the Christian Church ventured to openly proclaim her existence and show herself in the full light of day.

This is the theory which has been put forward by Strauss in Germany, and in France by Littré, under the name of Mythic Rationalism. It goes without saying that in the eyes of these men, the supernatural facts, the miracles ascribed to Jesus Christ by the Sacred Books, are only myths, the figurative expression of purely intellectual conceptions.

In the first volume of this work we have confuted this last assertion and proved by solid arguments, hitherto unanswered by modern infidels, the truth of the holy life, miracles and divinity of Christ, the Founder of Christianity.

We shall now overthrow the aforesaid mythical, irrational and historically groundless theory, by proving the following thesis. We shall begin by explaining some of the terms employed in its exposition.

We mean by *society,* a body of men, uniting their individual energies for a common end to be attained by common means. Thus every properly organized society necessarily comprises an end to be attained, and members who endeavor to reach that end by the use of certain determined means.

The *special nature* of a society is determined above and before all by the *end* aimed at. A society may be literary, scientific or commercial, according as the object aimed at by its members is the attainment of progress either in letters or in science or in commercial pursuits. It is in view of the special purpose to be secured that the members associate themselves together, and determine the means which they will employ to attain it.

Among the *elements of every society* whose existence is

intended to be permanent, one of the most essential is *authority*. In fact it is authority that forms and preserves the moral bond among the members composing it; it is authority that leads and directs the common action of the associates, urging them forward, moderating their activity, correcting their errors, as it may be deemed expedient for the good of each and all. Hence, in every society authority is invested with certain prerogatives, determined by the end which is to be attained by its subordinates.

Therefore, to say that Jesus Christ founded a Christian society is to say that He united His disciples in a body, in order that they should pursue a common end (their eternal salvation), by common means (preaching, worship, the Sacraments), and under an authority divinely established (members of the teaching and governing Church), constituted by Him. Let us prove in a few words that such is the case.

THESIS.—Jesus Christ has really and personally founded His religion under the form of a true society, a Church.

5. First Argument. We see in the Gospel: 1st, that Jesus Christ made a *formal promise* to institute a Church. Choosing among His twelve disciples Simon, to whom He gave the symbolic name of Peter, which means rock, He said to him: "*Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" (Matt. 16, 18.) This promise alone is, in itself, already an amply sufficient proof, for Jesus Christ could not have failed to fulfill what He promised. In the same sacred record we read also: 2ndly, that He has *fulfilled this promise* and founded His Church. In fact, He endowed His Apostles with *the same power* that He had received from His Father. He gave them the power and the mission *to preach* His doctrine to every human creature, to *administer* the Sacraments and *to govern* the Faithful, and He promised to be with them until the end of time. At the head of His Apostles He placed Simon on whom He conferred *universal jurisdiction* over the whole

Church. Surely all this was really founding a religious society, or Church. 3rdly. The same Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles show us the disciples after the Ascension fulfilling the mission they had received; they preach the doctrine of Jesus Christ, they enact laws for the government of the Faithful, their subjects, they increase from day to day the number of their disciples, ruling and governing them under the direction of Peter, their supreme head.

In this preliminary thesis we shall content ourselves with indicating the arguments; the developments, which they may require, will find their appropriate place in the theses that are to follow.

6. Second Argument, called the Argument of Prescription. The *very existence* of the Church proves her origin. As the existence for centuries of a people, of a civil society, proves the reality of its foundation, so the existence of the Church, that is to say, of that society distinct from all others, which has always borne the name of the Church of Christ, proves the reality of her institution. By its name, its worship, its temples, its Sacraments, its ministers, its organization, its general and particular Councils, the uninterrupted succession of its legitimate pastors, its wonderful institutions, its moral and civilizing influence, this religious society, the Church, has not ceased, during nineteen centuries, to attest that it was originally constituted by Jesus Christ.

7. Remarks. The above argument gains new force, if we bear in mind the following observations:

(*a*) He who speaks of religion, speaks of a concrete and living reality, *a society* professing belief in religious dogmas and submission to moral principles, consequently a Church. It thence results that *the Christian religion* and *the Christian Church* are *identically the same.* Hence, by the fact that Jesus Christ founded His *religion,* He also founded *His Church,* that is to say, the visible society of those who profess His doctrine.

(*b*) The greater part of the proofs by which we have established the divinity of the Christian religion, *directly* concerns *the Church.* Thus it is Christianity *as forming a society,*

a Church, which was foretold and described by the words of the prophets; it is the establishment of this Church which was divinely marked and sanctioned with the seal of miracles; it is her divine origin which was attested by the blood of martyrs; it is that Church that was miraculously founded and preserved, and has produced most wonderful fruits for the good of souls and the happiness of mankind.

8. Corollary. Peremptory Obligation on the Part of Man to Become a Member of This Church that He May Be Saved. This indispensable duty is easily deduced from what precedes. There are in this world societies which are voluntary or optional, and, unless constrained by obligations arising from special circumstances, no one is bound to belong to them. If a person agrees to assume the responsibility of membership, it is in order that he may be entitled to enjoy the advantages which these societies procure for their members. Such are financial companies and also religious Orders. If, after joining any of these societies, a man is obliged to remain in it, it is because he cannot leave without violating rights and obligations which he himself, of his own accord, had promised to maintain.

It is quite otherwise with the Christian society, the Church. Every man is under a strict obligation to enter it, for every man, as we have seen (I, 305), is obliged to profess Christianity. But Christianity is the same as the Church of Christ. We know, moreover, the formal injunction of Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church: "*Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned.*" (Mark 16, 15, 16.) This has always been the Catholic belief, the belief of the Fathers and the Councils. "Faith," said Pius IX, "teaches us that outside of the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved; she is the only ark of salvation; whosoever enters it not will be the victim of the deluge." We must observe, however, what we shall develop further on, that if without their fault some men are ignorant of the existence of the true Church and of the obligation to belong to her, they will not be pun-

ished for not entering it. We shall state, in due time, under what conditions men may form part of the *soul* of the Church and attain heaven. (See further Part VIII, ch. 2, "Out of the Church there is no Salvation.")

9. 3. Purpose or End of the Church. The proper and *direct end* of the Church founded by Jesus Christ, or the purpose which the Savior proposed to Himself in instituting her, is to lead men to eternal life. Nothing is more clear and evident than this in every page of the New Testament. Moreover, neither in theory nor in practice has the Church ever attributed to herself any other end. History is there to attest it. The Church, it is true, has also invariably contributed to the temporal happiness of individuals and of States; but this was only an *indirect* effect, though a natural outcome of her doctrinal teaching. (See Part X.)

With respect to this supernatural *end,* it can be said that the Church is a *spiritual* society, the society of souls. It is none the less true that the Church is *a visible and corporate* society. For, if it speaks to the soul, it is through the intermediary organs of the body; the means that she uses (preaching and the administering of the Sacraments) are corporal and sensible means; the authority which governs her is a physical and tangible authority. Hence we can see how ridiculous is the sophism of *some* Protestants who say: the Church is the society of souls, therefore it is all spiritual; and they argue therefrom that the Roman Church must be rejected, for the reason that she has a Pope, Bishops, Sacraments and religious ceremonies.

10. 4. Constitution of the Church or Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. In every civil State or society there must be necessarily two orders of members—those who command, and those who obey. There are likewise to be found in the Church two *constitutive elements:* those who teach and command, and those who listen and obey. The former constitute *the Church teaching* and *governing;* they are called pastors, the priesthood, the hierarchy; the latter form the *Church taught* and *governed,* and are called the Faithful or laity, the flock, the members of the fold.

In general three forms of government are to be found among men: the monarchic, the aristocratic, and the democratic.

(*a*) Monarchy, or the rule of a single person in whose hands the whole power of the State is concentrated.

(*b*) Aristocracy, or the rule of the best, when the supreme power is vested in the principal persons of the State, or in a privileged order of citizens.

(*c*) Democracy, or the rule of the people, when the governing power is exercised by the people through duly elected representatives. It is the monarchical form which the Church has received from her divine Founder. In fact, as we shall show further on, Peter was invested with the primacy, that is to say, the supreme power, which he was to transmit to his successors. But, as in a civil monarchy there exist in the provinces heads or governors, subject and subordinate to the ruling sovereign; so in the ecclesiastical monarchy there is a supreme and only head, who is the Pope, Vicar of Jesus Christ; and there are also in the various dioceses, subordinate chiefs, who are the Bishops. The Church is, therefore, by divine right, *a monarchy, wisely tempered by a kind of subordinate aristocracy.*

It is, therefore, an egregious mistake to look upon the Church as a society of equals, as is usually done by most Protestants. According to their view, all ecclesiastical power resides in the multitude of the Faithful. But as the people, as a whole, are incapable of exercising this power, they had to relieve themselves of this mission, by passing it over to delegates or mandatories; but, say these Protestants, it is the Christian people who are to choose these delegates, to determine and limit their powers, and when they deem it advisable to pronounce the forfeiture of these powers, and depose those to whom they had entrusted them. It follows clearly from the simple reading of the Scriptures that such a system is absolutely contrary to the will of the Church's divine Founder. The proof shall be set forth further on.

11. 5. The Church Is a Complete or Perfect Society. A complete or perfect society is one that possesses *in itself* all

the means necessary to attain its end. That a society be perfect it is necessary: 1st, that it should not enter as a part into any other society; thus, a financial corporation, which forms part of the State, and depends upon it, is incomplete; 2ndly, that it should not have a purpose directly subordinate to that of another society; thus the military society or the army evidently has an end subordinate to that of civil society, in whose defense it has been organized; 3rdly, that it should have in itself all the means of providing for its existence, preservation and the realization of its purpose. Now it can be proved that by the will of her divine Founder the Church realizes all these conditions. We shall demonstrate it shortly. The Church is therefore a perfect society. In order to be convinced of this, it suffices to glance through history. During the first three centuries the Church never ceased to pursue her purpose, which is the sanctification of souls. If she spread and firmly established herself, it was not only without the concurrence and help of the civil power, but in spite of most bitter persecution on its part. (See I. 253.) How, indeed, could the Church, a society of the *supernatural order*, receive of any society of a purely *natural order* the rights and resources necessary to attain its end? Supernatural means alone are proportionate to an end eminently supernatural, the eternal salvation of souls.

CHAPTER II

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST

12. In the preceding chapter we have seen that Jesus Christ founded a Church, the religious society into which every man is obliged to enter under penalty of missing his last end. We shall now enter into the principal question of this second volume of our Course directed to determine which, among the societies that bear the name of Christian, is the one that really has Jesus Christ as its Founder and preserves His doctrine in all its purity.

Division. In the first article of Chapter II we shall set forth the distinctive marks, notes or characteristics by which we may be enabled to recognize the true Church of Jesus Christ amidst the various Christian communities.

In the second article we shall show that the Catholic or Roman Church, whose head is the Bishop of Rome, possesses all these marks.

Chapters III and IV will show that the other Christian denominations (Protestant or Schismatic) do not possess these marks. Let us observe, however, that this last proof is not indispensable; as there is only *one* Church of Jesus Christ, if the divinity of the Roman Catholic Church be once clearly established, the demonstration necessarily proclaims the falsity of all others, for truth is one and immutable.

Finally, in Chapter V we shall prove that St. Peter and his successors received the supreme power or the primacy, both of honor and jurisdiction, in the Church, and we shall draw from it an easy means of distinguishing the true Church from all the sects which vainly attempt to usurp the title of the Church of Christ.

ART. I. THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST

13. The true religion, as we have seen, is obligatory for all men, and this true religion exists only in the Church founded by Jesus Christ. But God wills the salvation of all men (I Tim. 2, 1–4); it is, therefore, absolutely necessary that the true religion of Jesus Christ should at all times be recognized with certainty among the various religious societies that claim that honor. It is to render this recognition possible, easy and certain that the *marks* of the Church are needed.

Marks of the Church

We shall treat I, of the marks in general; II, of the division of these marks; III, of the positive marks in particular.

I. Marks of the Church in General

14. Definition. We call marks of the Church certain

characters, sensible, exclusive and permanent, by which the true Church of Christ can be recognized by all men in an easy and sure manner. Let us explain this definition.

(1) *Sensible characters,* that is, exteriorily perceptible. Qualities that really exist, but which escape observation, evidently cannot assist us in discerning the true Church.

(2) *Characters belonging to the Church alone,* and exclusively proper to the true Church of Christ. To use the words of the celebrated controversialist Cardinal Bellarmine: "If I wish to designate and describe to you a man whom you have never met, and enable you to know him at first sight, will it be enough for me to say: he has two hands, two ears, two eyes? By no means, for those are features and traits common to all men." (See n. 3 for right definition.)

(3) *Permanent characters,* that is, characters that subsist throughout all the ages of the Church. This is an immediate consequence of what we have previously said. As it is always and everywhere a strict obligation for men to enter the Church, the sole way of salvation, it is supremely important that they should everywhere and always be enabled to discern the way leading to salvation; it follows, therefore, that the characters which help in this discernment must be constant and permanent.

(4) Lastly, *characters by which the true Church of Christ can be recognized by all men in an easy and certain manner.* As all men are obliged to enter the Church, and as the greater number are incapable of making a serious examination and a profound study of the subject, the merciful Providence of God has disposed that it shall not be too difficult to discern the true Church by the assistance and application of these characters. (Isaias 35, 8.) It goes without saying, however, that each person perceives this demonstration more or less vividly according to the acuteness of his intellect; but the conviction of the learned man, whilst more enlightened and more deliberate, is none the less of the same nature as the conviction of the uneducated.

Remark. It results from what we have said that among the prerogatives or endowments necessary to the Church, there

are some that can serve in nowise as characters or marks. Such are the indefectibility and infallibility of the Church. For these are not outwardly perceptible nor more easily recognizable than the Church herself. Quite the contrary; it is only after having *previously* discerned the true Church that we can say of her: the true Church must be indefectible, permanent and infallible in her teaching.

II. Division of the Marks or Characteristic Notes of the Church

15. All the marks of the Church are qualities that are real, and characters that are positive. However, according to their value as proofs, they are usually divided into *positive* and *negative* marks. The *negative* marks or notes (if we may truly give them that name, for the above definition is not rigorously applicable to them) are those marks the *absence* of which proves evidently that a given society *is not* the Church of Jesus Christ, though their *presence* in a religious body does not prove by itself alone that the body possessing them is the true Church. We cite as examples certain marks generally advanced by Protestants on behalf of some creed, such as perfect morality of its doctrine, sincerity of its preachers, the right use of the Sacraments, as well as just and peaceful methods employed in its propagation. These several characters are undoubtedly indispensable to the true Church; but besides the fact that they may, at least in theory, exist during a certain time in a dissident sect, they are practically as difficult to recognize as the Church herself.

On the contrary, the *positive* marks have quite a different value: these *belong exclusively* to the true Church of Christ. As soon as they are proven to exist in a religious society, we are justified in concluding unhesitatingly that *this society* is the true Church.

Apologists differ as to the enumeration of these marks, whether negative or positive. We shall speak only of the four marks generally admitted and enumerated in the Creed of Constantinople, which has been inserted in the liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They are Unity, Sanctity,

Catholicity, Apostolicity—*Et unam, sanctam, Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.* This Creed, or Symbol of Faith, based on that of Nicea (A.D. 325), was drawn up by the Fathers of the first General Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), and contains an explicit confession of the divinity of the Holy Ghost, a truth which the heretic Macedonius denied.

III. Positive Marks

A. First Positive Mark—Unity

16. This unity is twofold; it comprises: (1) Unity of *doctrine and Faith,* which consists in the common accord of all the Faithful in admitting and believing all that the teaching Church proposes to them as revealed or confirmed by Jesus Christ. (2) Unity of *government,* which produces unity of *communion,* and which consists in the submission of all the Faithful to their respective Bishops, and in particular to the Roman Pontiff, supreme Head of the Church. To break the unity of Faith, by rejecting even only one point of doctrine, constitutes heresy; to break the unity of government, by rejecting the authority of the legitimate heads, produces schism.

I. UNITY OF DOCTRINE AND BELIEF

THESIS.—JESUS CHRIST INTENDED THAT HIS CHURCH SHOULD HAVE UNITY OF DOCTRINE AND BELIEF, THAT IS TO SAY, HE ENJOINED IT AS AN OBLIGATION UPON PASTORS TO TEACH, AND, AS A CONSEQUENCE, UPON THE FAITHFUL TO BELIEVE ALL THE TRUTHS REVEALED BY HIM, WITHOUT EITHER ADDITION OR DIMINUTION. (See Apocalypse 22, 18–19.)

17. FIRST ARGUMENT, taken from the Holy Scriptures. (1) "*Go ye therefore,*" said Jesus to His Apostles, "*teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" (Matt. 28, 19–20.) Jesus here makes no exception; He even *excludes* exceptions by the emphasis which He places upon His words:

"You shall teach them," He says, "to *observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" He thus enjoins faith in the *whole* doctrine, as well as obedience to *all* His commandments. Again He says: "*Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned.*" (Mark 16, 15, 16.) If it were enough to believe and admit only a few truths, and we were free to accept or reject the others, Jesus Christ would necessarily have said so, because, as He Himself decides, it is a question of either salvation or of damnation according to the observance or the transgression of His commands. Nor does Jesus make any exception when He says: "*He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth me.*" (Luke 10, 16.) And in another place, speaking of a rebellious subject, He says: "*If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.*" (Matt. 18, 17.)

(2) The Apostles hold the same language as their Master. There is not to be found in the Epistles of St. Paul a single word which suggests the slightest distinction between one dogma and another, one truth and another, as if one could be admitted and the other rejected. The Apostle announces the doctrine of Jesus Christ, nothing more and nothing less. He anathematizes any one who would preach anything else, even if it were himself or an angel come down from heaven. "*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.*" (Gal. 1, 8.) He begs of the Romans to keep away from those who sow dissension and scandals against the doctrine which they have learned. (Rom. 16, 17.) He implores the Corinthians to have all one and the same language, not to suffer schism in their midst (I Cor. 1, 10); he condemns old schisms and heresies without distinction, under pain of damnation. St. John speaks in the same way. According to him, "*whosoever revolteth, and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God.*" He adds: "*If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him, God speed you.*" (II John 1, 9–10.)

18. Second Argument, taken from the teachings of the early Fathers of the Church and the ancient Councils.

(1) Driven to the wall by the unanswerable arguments of Catholic theologians, the French Calvinist Jurieu introduced during the XVIIth century into the doctrine of Jesus Christ a distinction absolutely unknown before his time. He made a distinction between *fundamental* articles, which men are obliged to believe, and *non-fundamental* articles, which they are free to reject. This division, according to his contention, was generally admitted during the first four centuries of the Church. It was only about the Vth century that this distinction was suppressed and that the Faithful found themselves thenceforward obliged to believe without distinction all the dogmas revealed by Jesus Christ. In any case, the system of *fundamentals* is fatal to the cause of Protestantism, in support of which it was devised. For either it is true, or it is false; if it is true, then, as the Catholic Church holds and always did hold the fundamentals (for there is no doctrine called fundamental by Protestants but what is believed by the Catholic Church), it was an inconsistent and wicked act to separate from her; and it is a most dangerous act to remain in open schism with that Church who, avowedly holding the essential truths of salvation, holds also that *out of her pale there is no salvation.* If, on the contrary, that system is false, then Protestantism is also false, by the very fact that it was first to invent it and to embrace it.

We do not believe it necessary to devote much space to refuting this distinction, invented for the purpose of defending a desperate cause, and eagerly adopted by all the Protestants of that time. It would be easy to show that this system, now generally abandoned, is formally opposed to Sacred Scripture, on which, however, Protestants claim to ground their belief exclusively; that it completely destroys the authority of Jesus Christ; that it is opposed to the belief of all Christians up to the XVIIth century; finally, that it is altogether arbitrary and absolutely impracticable. How will

Protestants decide what articles are to be held as fundamental, when they acknowledge in the interpretation of the Word of God no other rule than private judgment and individual reason? If, as Jurieu would have it, the surest rule is to admit as fundamental and necessary for salvation only that which Christians have unanimously thought and still think to be such, the surest rule would be to have no longer any belief at all in religious matters, for is there a single dogma which has not been rejected by one set of heretics or another? And again, this distinction reacts against Protestants themselves and condemns their separation from the Catholic Church. In fact, as the Church, even according to their admission, has always professed and still professes the articles that they declare fundamental, what motives could they have to justify their separation from her? Why do we still see them in our day flinging against the Roman Church and the Bishop of Rome their invectives and their calumnies?

It is quite evident, if this alleged change in doctrine had taken place in the early ages, it would have brought on numberless protests from the Fathers and Bishops, as well as from the Faithful and from the heretics themselves. We know the unremitting vigilance ever displayed by the Church to preserve purity and integrity of doctrine; the numberless Councils, general and particular, assembled to treat of dogmatic questions, abundantly testify to this unceasing vigilance. The history of these times, which speaks even of the less important heresies with great care and many details, tells of no protestations or reproaches. And what is still more striking, no Catholic, no heretic, and even no Protestant before Jurieu ever noticed any such innovation, no one ever dreamt of making it a matter of reproach against the Church. This is because in reality the Church has never varied on that point, and consequently all tradition condemns this theory.

(2) Moreover, it is absolutely false to assert that the Fathers and the Bishops of the *first four centuries* taught the distinction discovered by Jurieu at so remote a date. On the contrary, when they speak of the teachings of the Gospel and the obligation to believe in them, they always do so in *uni-*

versal terms which *imply no restrictions.* According to them, that which must be taught, that which must be believed is *the doctrine of Christ;* he who teaches otherwise is a heretic, and the man who believes in his words, participates in his heresy; and they are, both of them, excluded from the communion of the Church, and consequently from salvation. These Fathers and these Bishops, teaching and professing such unchangeable doctrine, even if taken alone, without reference to Councils, are quite numerous; Cardinal Gousset in his "Dogmatic Theology" reproduces the testimony of twenty-one of them, from St. Ignatius of Antioch and St. Polycarp of Smyrna, disciples of the Apostles, to St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Ambrose. We should not fail to notice that all these Fathers and Doctors lived before the Vth century.

19. Third Argument, taken from reason. Common sense alone should tell us that when the fact of divine Christian revelation is once admitted, it cannot be a matter of indifference to believe that there are seven Sacraments or less than seven; that Confession is necessary for the forgiveness of sins or that it is not; that Jesus Christ is really present in the Holy Eucharist or that He is there only figuratively. Can any one seriously believe that he who adores the consecrated Host and he who tramples it under foot, are equally agreeable to God, and true disciples of Jesus Christ? Is it permissible to believe that one can save his soul without adding good works to faith? Is it not evident that religions which profess doctrines so opposed to each other cannot all be true? Is it not evident that there can be only *one and the same religion,* teaching the one and indivisible doctrine of Jesus Christ? And yet Protestantism maintains that religious truth, viz., divine revelation, is compatible with the profession of opposite creeds, thus putting itself in contradiction with common sense. (James 2, 14, 17, 26.)

II. Unity of Government or of Ministry

20 Jesus Christ has enjoined unity of government no less than unity of doctrine.

This is *a question of fact;* in commanding the Pope and the Bishops to announce the truth which He brought into the world, Jesus Christ also confided to them the dispensing of the Sacraments, the ordering of worship, and all that concerns the government of the Faithful.

Observation. There are Protestants who acknowledge and admit some kind of power in their ministers. But, in the first place, according to them, the authority with which these ministers are invested in nowise binds the Faithful; for they ascribe to each Christian individually a right to form, in the last resort, his own opinion on religious questions, to decide what he will believe and what he will reject. Moreover, this power, far from being confided to the Bishops, united and subject to the Roman Pontiff, is, according to them, rightfully exercised by each pastor whom the Faithful may acknowledge as such, on condition, however, that in the preaching office and the administration of the Sacraments he does not reject any of the so-called fundamental articles.

As to the Schismatic Greeks, they deny, it is well known, *the primacy of jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome* in the exercise of the ministry, and consequently, the obligation of Bishops and their flock to form part of the Roman Communion.

THESIS.—Jesus Christ has constituted in His Church an authority, which He confided to His Apostles, and especially to Peter, and to which all the faithful must submit; consequently, whosoever separates himself from them, refusing obedience in matters pertaining to the exercise of their ministry, goes out from the true Church by the way of SCHISM, just as the innovator in matters of doctrine goes out from the Church by the way of HERESY.

21. Argument, drawn from Scripture. (1) Jesus explicitly declared that He sent His Apostles as His Father had sent Him; He commanded them to preach the Gospel, administer Baptism, and teach all things that He had taught them Himself, promising to remain with them forever. As we will

prove further on in a separate chapter, He specially named Peter as Supreme Head and foundation of His Church; He gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven; He explicitly commanded him to feed all His flock, the sheep, that is, the pastors, as well as the lambs, or the Faithful (John 21), and He promised to ratify all the decisions of Peter. (Matt. 16, 19.) One day, speaking to the Apostles and the disciples whom He had associated with them, Jesus gave to them practical teachings of high importance, among which there is one which immediately concerns the present question: *"If thy brother shall offend thee,"* He said, *"go and reprove him between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican."* (Matt. 18, 15–17.) It would be easy to show that the witnesses of whom Jesus speaks should not be called for the purpose of pronouncing judgment, but simply to uphold by their presence the reclamations of him who is offended. Moreover, the words of the Master which follow immediately those we have just cited do not allow the slightest doubt as to the power confided to His Apostles: *"Amen, I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."* (Matt. 18, 18.) These words, which previously had been said to Peter alone, are now addressed to all the Apostles whom Jesus Christ associated with him in the government of the Church, and this without detriment to the primacy already instituted. Moreover, we must carefully notice, it is not a question of Faith that is referred to here, but a question of spiritual direction, the reparation of an injury done by a brother to a brother. And yet Jesus says in *formal terms* that if the culprit refuse to *submit* to the Church, he should be considered as a heathen and a publican, that is, as belonging no longer to the Church. There exists, therefore, in the Church a governing authority established by the Savior to

which all the Faithful must submit *under pain of being separated from the Church.*

(2) The same ministry is insisted upon by St. Paul in many of his epistles. He writes to the Ephesians: "*And some, indeed, He* (Christ) *gave to be apostles, and some prophets, and others evangelists, and others pastors and doctors, for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, unto the edification of the body of Christ, till we all meet in unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God; . . . that we may be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine.*" (Eph. 4, 11-14. He recommends to the Galatians union, concord, and subordination, placing *schisms,* which he calls sects, on the same level as the works of the flesh, *which exclude from the kingdom of heaven.* In another place, he commands the Bishops to "*take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood. I know that, after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock, and of your own selves shall arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.*" (Acts 20, 28-30.)

Surely, this is a ministry clearly defined; *in its origin,* which is the will of God; *in its depositaries,* who are the heads of the Church, and more particularly Peter; and *in its object,* which is the preservation of the Faithful in the unity of the Faith. Now, if the Faithful were not obliged to submit to this authority, for what purpose does it exist, and why, in case of refusal, should men be excluded from the kingdom of heaven?

We could draw a no less conclusive proof from *the teaching of the Fathers,* and in particular from the admirable letter which St. Clement, disciple and companion of the great Apostle St. Paul, wrote to the Corinthians for the purpose of appeasing a schism which had just broken out among them. This letter enjoyed exceptional authority, so much so that for a long time it was read in the Eastern Churches with the books of the Scriptures themselves. It may be found in

Gousset and in the "Conferences" of Father Olivier, and also in many authentic quotations found in the works of St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, and others.

B. Second Positive Mark—Sanctity

22. Before considering sanctity as a note or mark, thus enabling us to recognize the true Church, we shall speak of it at first in a more general way, and refute an error of the Protestants concerning the question at issue.

I. THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH IN GENERAL

If we were satisfied with vague and general terms, we might say that Protestants, as well as Catholics, acknowledge sanctity as a quality or property necessary to the Church. According to them, as well as to us, Jesus wished that His Church should be saintly, and He founded her for no other purpose than the sanctification of men. It would be difficult for anyone to contest this point. St. Paul is most emphatic in his language. Writing to the Ephesians he speaks thus: "*Christ loved the church, and delivered Himself up for it that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. That He might present it to Himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing; but that it shall be holy and without blemish.*" (Eph. 5, 25–27.)

But when the question arises as to what constitutes this sanctity, Protestants, some by excess, others by default, fall into two errors directly opposed to each other. The former, confounding the sanctity of the Church with the sanctity of each of her members, claim that the Just alone, who are known to none but God, form part of the Church of Christ.

The others, as we said, sin by default. They are satisfied with an ordinary and commonplace sanctity, shared by all the members of the Church, and reject as foreign to the spirit of the Gospel everything that savors of heroism and perfection, and in particular the religious life and vows. Above all, they will not hear of miracles performed in confirmation of eminent sanctity.

Catholic truth, as in many other instances, is found midway between these two extremes; thus it is what we call the golden mean.

This is, in brief, her teaching on the subject: The Church is holy because her *Author* is holy and the very source of holiness; because her *object* is the sanctification of men; because the means which she uses, her dogma, her moral doctrine, her Sacraments, are holy in themselves and lead to holiness; because, at all times, *many of her members* have been distinguished for their sanctity, some of them—those who have fully followed her directions—have even become conspicuous by *eminent* sanctity; finally, because true miracles have been performed to manifest and confirm this sanctity. But before proceeding let us establish the following thesis:

THESIS.—The Church of Jesus Christ is not exclusively composed of men just before God

23. First Argument, derived from the teaching of Jesus Christ. The figures under which Jesus Christ represents His Church show her as invariably composed of just men and of sinners. She contains the wheat and the chaff, the faithful servant and the unfaithful, the prudent and the foolish virgins, the sterile fig-tree preserved near the fruitful ones; she is a field of tares mingled with the good seed until the harvest day; a net thrown into the sea and bringing in all kinds of fish, good and bad, the good to be kept, the bad to be rejected.

Second Argument, taken from the conduct of the Apostles. It was in this sense that the Apostles taught by Jesus understood the matter. We see them, it is true, recalling to duty those Christians whose conduct was not in keeping with their Faith; but they are far from treating them as strangers to the Church. Because St. Paul separates from the communion of the Church the scandalous sinner of Corinth, and ratifies the excommunication and expulsion of the two heretics, Hymeneus and Alexander, already excluded by the very fact of their public and notorious heresy (I Cor. 5; I Tim. 1, 20), the Apostle does not therefore consider as ban-

ished from the Church other sinners, whom he does not cut off from the communion of the Faithful.

II. THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH CONSIDERED AS A MARK OF TRUTH

24. We have seen that the Church is holy in many ways and under several aspects. These different kinds of holiness are not all equally helpful in the discernment of the true Church. Some are not easy to discover, and consequently cannot serve as marks of the true Church of Christ; others could only serve as negative marks.

The holiness which is available more particularly as a positive mark of the Church is the sanctity of her members, and especially the extraordinary and *heroic* sanctity of some of her members. This characteristic is easily perceived, for eminent sanctity must naturally manifest itself, at least from time to time, by extraordinary outward works. Moreover, this holiness is at times confirmed by astounding miracles.

The gift of miracles, in fact, belongs to the true Church, as her own exclusive privilege; it is not an accidental and transitory thing; it is the fulfilling of promises repeatedly made by Jesus Christ, and which were not limited to any particular time. "*He that believeth in me,*" says the Savior, "*the works that I do, he shall also do, and greater than these shall he do.*" (John 14, 12.) And He also says: "*These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover.*" (Mark 16, 17–18.) Therefore, if miracles were no longer required to prove the divinity of the Christian religion, they would still be necessary to fulfill the promise of Jesus Christ.

C. Third Positive Mark—Catholicity

25. Catholic means universal. By applying the word to the Church of Jesus Christ is meant that at all the epochs of her existence, after a sufficient diffusion of the Gospel the

Church should *be morally spread, everywhere the same,* and without any change, *throughout the whole world.*

We say *everywhere the same,* for true Catholicity supposes unity of doctrine and government; without this the Church that exists in China, for instance, would not be the same as that which exists in Brazil, and it would be false to say: this Church is at the same time in Brazil and in China. A union of sects that would have nothing in common but a name, and such, no one can help knowing, is the case with Protestantism, would not deserve the name of Catholic or universal religion, even if this union were spread throughout the world by the various elements or sects composing it. A heap of loose stones, no matter how large, cannot be called a building.

Catholicity may be considered either absolutely, in itself, or relatively, by comparison with dissenting sects.

(1) Taken in an *absolute* sense, Catholicity does not require that the Church should exist simultaneously in all parts of the world without any exception, much less that she should embrace the universality of mankind. St. Matthew says that when the Gospel shall have been preached to all the nations, the end of the world shall be at hand. And Jesus, answering, said: "*. . . This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations: and then shall the consummation come.*" (Matt. 24, 14.) Here then we only speak of a *moral* universality. That the Church should deserve the name of Catholic, it is sufficient that she should contain a great number of members, and that she should exist in most of the known parts of the earth, so that she may from these easily spread to other countries. "It is necessary," says an illustrious theologian, Suarez, "that the Church should spread over the world a certain universal splendor, so that her light may reach out everywhere, and men may be enabled to distinguish her from all the heretical sects." The Scriptures properly understood and Tradition from the first ages require only this moral universality.

(2) If Catholicity be considered *relatively,* viz., as compared with the dissenting sects, it is not necessary that the Church be more numerous than all the other Christian com-

munities taken together, but it is enough that it surpass in numbers each of the sects taken separately, viz., according to the number of adherents to each separate creed.

THESIS.—Catholicity is a necessary characteristic mark of the true Church

26. Proof, taken from Scripture. (1) In the first place it is certain that the prophecies concerning the Messias and His work, many of which have been already quoted (I, 231), represent the Church as destined to spread herself all over the world. She shall be the light of nations, the light that shall shine as far as the extremities of the earth; the house of the Lord in which all nations shall be assembled; a high mountain which will fill all the earth. The Messias shall have the nations for His inheritance, and for His possession the extremities of the earth. All the kings of the earth shall adore Him, and all the nations obey Him. From dawn to eventide His name shall be adored by all the nations, and in all places a pure oblation and sacrifice shall be offered to His name. These passages, and many others which it would be too long to recall, are inexplicable, if they do not signify the moral spreading of the Church of Christ over all the earth.

(2) Moreover, the words of Jesus Himself are no less explicit. He ordered His disciples to preach the Gospel to every creature, to instruct all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things that He had commanded them. He sent them to be witnesses unto Him at Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and to the uttermost extremities of the world.

(3) The Apostles understood perfectly well the purpose of their Master. Faithful to His commands, they preach the Gospel at first in Judea and Samaria, then they disperse among heathen nations, and soon St. Paul can truthfully write to the Romans that their Faith is preached throughout the world; and to the Colossians that the Gospel has spread all over the earth. The Apostles, therefore, knew full well that

the Catholicity of the Church was willed by Jesus Christ, and that it was one of her essential properties. Hence they included in the Apostolic Creed this article of Faith: "I believe in the Holy *Catholic* Church."

The reader will find on this subject many testimonies of the Fathers cited in the theological works of Gousset and in the "Conferences" of Father Olivier. See also the excellent work of Father Waterworth, "The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church" (Pustet & Co., New York, 1885), vol. II, article entitled "The Church Catholic or Universal," where hundreds of quotations covering nearly twenty pages are to be found.

This Catholicity is a mark which serves to distinguish the true Church, for it offers us *an easy means* of recognizing the true Church: it is not difficult to ascertain the fact that among Christian societies it is the only one of which it can be said that it has been morally spread all over the earth from the time that the Gospel was sufficiently promulgated, and that it includes in its fold the greatest number of members professing the same Faith, partaking of the same Sacraments, and participating in the same worship, under the direction of the same legitimate pastors.

Remark. It must not be forgotten that all the marks of the Church, and Catholicity in particular, serve to distinguish the true Church from *other Christian societies*. It is by following another line of arguments that we have proven, in the first part, the exclusive divinity of the Christian religion, as opposed to all other forms of un-Christian belief.

D. Fourth Positive Mark—Apostolicity

27. In saying that the true Church is necessarily Apostolic, we mean in the first place that she must profess the doctrine taught by the Apostles: this is Apostolicity of doctrine. Secondly, she must be able to trace back to the Apostles the unbroken succession of the legitimate heads: this is Apostolicity of the ministry or of government.

Apostolicity of *doctrine* is a logically indispensable consequence of the *unity* required in the true Church, and, indeed, its necessity is not denied; but this property is of little use as a *mark,* as a positive means of discerning the true Church. It is, therefore, the Apostolicity of *the ministry* that here concerns us most. But we have proven (nn. 5–8) that authority in the Church was really confided to the Apostles. It now remains to show that this authority was to be transmitted without interruption to their legitimate successors. Apostolicity then is the mark which reason would absolutely require that the true Church should display, and the absence of which it would deem fatal to her claims, even if she were to possess the three others. What a judge would say to a man who claimed to be heir-at-law to some title or estate, the same can reason fairly say to the Church claiming to be the true Church of Christ: "Show and prove your pedigree." The ruling, teaching and sanctifying powers of the true Church must, of course, have been transmitted by the Apostles, who originally received them from Christ, to successors, and these in turn must have handed them down to others. The Church that cannot trace her pedigree back to the Apostles through an unbroken succession of pastors, cannot be the true Church; hence the necessity of firmly establishing the following:

THESIS.—Jesus Christ wished and disposed that the powers, which He confided to His Apostles, should be transmitted by them to their successors until the end of time.

28. First Argument. (1) This thesis flows from the very *purpose* which the Savior had in view in investing His Apostles with the authority He held from His Father, which was to bring to salvation all men *until the end of time. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."* (John 20, 21.) *"You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and have appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit, and your fruit should remain."* (John 15, 16.) As wise as He was powerful, the divine Master could not fail to

provide the means of attaining the end He had in view. As His Apostles were to die in the course of time, His will evidently was that their ministry should pass to their legitimate successors, considered as forming with them a single moral person. And it is in this sense that we must understand the promise of perennial assistance implied in the words addressed by Christ to His first Apostles: "*Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*" (Matt. 28, 20.)

(2) Jesus Christ *assures* them that His Church will last as long as the world. But a society cannot exist without authority, which is its basis. This authority must be perpetuated forever in the Church; and since it was the Apostles who received the necessary powers, it was to *them alone* that the right belonged to transmit these powers to those whom they might choose, and for the latter in their turn to transmit them to others until the end of the world.

Second Argument. We learn from history that the Apostles have really transmitted to others the powers which they received from Jesus Christ, for they appointed everywhere Bishops to replace them and to succeed them. Thus St. Paul appointed Timothy Bishop of Ephesus and Titus Bishop of Crete, charging them to guard the deposit of Faith and to perpetuate their ministry by appointing other pastors. (Tit. 1, 5.)

Third Argument. Tradition. That an Apostolic succession is essential for the discernment of the true Church the Fathers unanimously teach. A few quotations will suffice. St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (A.D. 177), after enumerating the Bishops of Rome, who had succeeded each other from St. Peter, adds: "By this order and by this succession the preaching of the truth which is in the Church has come down to us from the Apostles; and this is a most complete demonstration that the life-giving Faith is one and the same, which from the Apostles even until now has been preserved in the Church and transmitted in truthfulness." (Adv. hæres., iii, 3.) Tertullian (A.D. 380) writes of such heretical and schismatical Churches as pretended to be the true Church of Christ: "Let them unroll the line of their Bishops, so com-

ing down by succession from the beginning, that their first Bishop had for his consecrator and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or Apostolic men. Let the heretics exhibit something of the same sort." (De præscript.) St. Augustine (A.D. 400) says explicitly: "What keeps me in the Catholic Church is an authority begun with miracles. . . . strengthened by antiquity; it is the *succession of Bishops and priests* from the very Chair of Peter (to whom the Lord committed the sheep to be fed) down to even my present Bishop." (Contr. Ep. Fund. Manich.)

29. Remark. The authority with which Jesus Christ invested His Apostles comprised a two-fold power: The power of *Orders* and the power of *jurisdiction.* The first, which regards the administration of the Sacraments, and which cannot be *lost,* is conferred by *Ordination.* The Bishops alone possess it in its fullness, and therefore there is no priestly office which they may not exercise; to them alone belongs the power of conferring upon others the sacred character which they have themselves received. Should a Bishop become a schismatic or a heretic, he could ordain Bishops and priests *validly* but *not legitimately.* The power of jurisdiction requires *canonical institution,* or a definite or authoritative nomination, and it can be withdrawn by the legitimate heads of the Church. This power of jurisdiction comprises, at the same time, the faculty of exercising legitimately, the power of Orders, and the *right* to take part in the *government* of the Church.

To belong to the legitimate line of the pastors of the Church, or to the hierarchy of jurisdiction, it is not enough that a Bishop should have received the power of Orders; he must have received besides the mission or authorization to govern a diocese. This statement, which we can deduce from the words of all the Fathers condemning as schismatics Bishops occupying usurped sees, is moreover evident enough by itself. The Episcopate is founded for the government of the Church, and the Bishop is chief and ruler in the Church. He must therefore have subjects on whom to exercise his authority or governing power. But *one cannot give himself*

subjects. Jesus alone, who had received from His Father the nations as an inheritance, could confide to those whomsoever He might choose the power to govern the Faithful, that is to say, the power of *jurisdiction.* He confided it to the Apostles, and principally to Peter, their head, with the mission to transmit it to their successors. As to the mode of transmission, which was not determined by Jesus Christ Himself, it is for the heads of the Church to prescribe it.

This *mode* or *method* may have varied in the course of time, especially as to the appointments of the persons who were to receive jurisdiction. Without ever prejudicing the essential right of free nomination, which the Vicar of Christ possesses for all dignities inferior to his own, it has happened that at times these persons were designated by election, at others by presentation, sometimes the simple will of the successor of Peter has alone sufficed.

As it was the Church, and not Jesus Christ, that determined the canonical rules to be observed in this transmission, the Church has the right to *modify* them according to circumstances. But the jurisdiction itself dwells at all times in the heads of the Church, and is always transmitted according to the canonical rules in force at the time. Whosoever, therefore, has not received jurisdiction, *according to those rules,* saving the imprescriptible right of the sovereign pastor, remains without it; and even if he should have received the episcopal character, he does not belong *to the hierarchy of jurisdiction.* Having no see and no subjects, it is evident that he is not a *chief* in the Church, and that he does not belong *to the Apostolic succession.*

30. Remarks. (1) Bishops have the same functions and the same powers as the Apostles had. There are, however, some special privileges which the Apostles alone enjoyed as *founders* of the Church, and which they did not transmit to their successors; these are personal infallibility in the teaching of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the right to preach the Faith *everywhere* and to govern the Faithful; to erect bishopries on their own authority.

(2) The two powers of Order and jurisdiction are com-

municated to priests, but only in part and for the purpose of certain acts, for instance, for sacramental absolution. But this important subject calls for further development.

"The power of Order gives capacity; the power of jurisdiction permits the use of authority. The distinction between 'can' and 'may,' the former expressing power *inherent* (to Order), the latter power *dependent* (on jurisdiction), affords a good illustration of the subject. The dispenser of the power of Order is but an instrument; the grantor of the power of jurisdiction exercises authority and dominion. The first coming directly from Christ is abiding and unchangeable. It is conferred in equal measure on each priest and Bishop as to the power of consecration. The second not coming immediately, but through the Church, from Christ to individuals, is conferred in varying proportions, as may be deemed expedient for the good of souls.

In the instances mentioned above (n. 28, SECOND ARGUMENT), Timothy and Titus had neither more nor less of episcopal character than had any of the Apostles; as Bishops they were equal. But the Apostles had *universal* jurisdiction directly from Christ. Timothy and Titus received their commission from the Apostles; it was restricted to the Church at Ephesus, and to the Church in Crete; it was neither sovereign nor independent.

Timothy and Titus were consecrated Bishops, but the Episcopate of authority, of which they were appointed participators, was one, indivisible, sovereign and independent. It was given first in its fullness to Peter *separately* (Matt. 16, 19); later the power of binding and loosing was given *collectively to the Apostolic College.* (Matt. 18, 18.) Thus did Jesus Christ establish two indestructible elements in the organization of the Church:

(*a*) The Apostolate, consisting in universal jurisdiction derived directly from Christ.

(*b*) The one Episcopate, founded immediately by Christ, and exercising corporate jurisdiction in the whole world.

The first resides in the successor of St. Peter, who is therefore the supreme governor, the supreme teacher of the Church,

with whom there must be communion in order to be in the visible organic body, the Fold of Christ.

The second resides in the body of Bishops conjointly, who thus together represent the Apostolic College; but to have part in this Episcopate the individual must be appointed by the Head of the Church, or by the Head with the Episcopate.

31. "In this way has every Bishop proper and ordinary jurisdiction in his diocese, and yet is not sovereign and independent. Therefore not by delegated or vicarious power, but by the Holy Ghost, do Bishops rule in the Church of God, as the successors not of individual Apostles, but of the Apostolic College. "*The Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the church of God.*" Address of St. Paul to the clergy of Ephesus. (Acts 20, 28.) From "The Catholic Church," by Monsignor Capel.) As Cardinal Hergenrother writes in *Church and State,* vol. 1, p. 177: "The episcopal power of jurisdiction is therefore not derived 'immediately from Christ,' in so far as it exists in individuals; it has been established by Christ, but is not conferred immediately by Him upon individual Bishops; it is imparted to them by the Head of the Church, or by Bishops He has authorized. Thus the unity of the Episcopate, so much insisted on by the Fathers, is fully upheld; the Holy See is head, root, spring and origin of the spiritual authority."

St. Thomas Aquinas, the Prince of Theologians, who died in 1274, that is, fully three centuries previous to the so-called Reformation, expresses with much precision the distinction between Order and jurisdiction. (3. S. 2, 34.)

"Although schismatics have the power of Order," says Suarez, "De ordine," "yet they are deprived of the authority of jurisdiction."

"Spiritual power is twofold—the one sacramental, the other jurisdictional. Sacramental is that which is conferred by some consecration. But all consecrations of the Church are permanent so long as the matter which is consecrated remains, this even in things inanimate—an altar once consecrated cannot be reconsecrated, unless it be afterwards broken. And, therefore, this power remains as to its essence in a man who

has received it by consecration so long as he lives, whether he fall into schism or heresy. But as inferior power ought not to be brought into action unless it be moved by superior power, as is seen in nature, it follows that those (who fall into schism or heresy) lose the use of the power, and it is not lawful *for* them to use it. If, nevertheless, they do so, their power produces its effect in Sacraments, for in these man is but the instrument of God. Hence the effects of Sacraments are not prevented on account of any guilt in the minister of the Sacraments.

"But jurisdictional power is that which is conferred by the simple concession of man; such power does not inhere permanently; hence such power does not remain with schismatics and heretics; they, therefore, are unable to absolve, to excommunicate, to grant indulgences and the like. Should they do so, the acts would be null and void.

"When, therefore, it is said that schismatics and heretics have not spiritual power, it is to be understood of jurisdiction; but if power of Order be referred to, then not its essence, but its legitimate use is meant."

Remark. Here validity of Sacred Orders is evidently supposed; for should it be wanting, then there would be neither power of Order nor of jurisdiction, as it is the case with Anglicans, and, in fact, with all modern Protestant sects.

To this clear statement of St. Thomas may be added the still more explicit teaching of Suarez on the way of receiving Papal and episcopal jurisdiction:

"The pontifical power is, as it were, the primal example of all spiritual power of jurisdiction; for no one will deny that that is a true power of active jurisdiction—nay, in that order, is the highest that can exist in mere man. Now that power is *not* given to the Pontiff by any consecration, but by *election* and the bare grant of God; for when He said to Peter 'Feed my sheep,' He impressed upon him no new consecration or character, but gave him a mere power of jurisdiction. So, too, the Pope, *when rightly elected,* is immediately true Pope as to such power, and as to that he receives no consecration; nay, if not already a Bishop or a priest, he must be after-

wards consecrated or even ordained, and, nevertheless, in the meantime he can exercise *all acts of mere external jurisdiction.* Therefore, in the same manner, the proper power of jurisdiction is granted to other Bishops by *election* or *simple concession,* not by consecration, for the principle is the same, not only because the episcopal power is but a certain participation of the papal power, but likewise because, as in the appointment of the Pope, to apply to him, matter or subjects (for the exercise of his jurisdiction) is nothing else but to give to him a true and new power over them; so when a See is given to a Bishop consecrated before, matter (for jurisdiction) is applied to him not otherwise than that certain persons become his subjects, who were not so before; nor do they become his subjects save by the fact that he receives as superior a new power altogether distinct from the power of Order or from consecration. Lastly, because, just as acts of Pontifical jurisdiction as such are *not* acts of *Order* or *consecration, nor flow from it,* so neither are acts of episcopal jurisdiction functions of Order or consecration." (De leg., iv, 4.) Let us now come to the application of the aforesaid marks.

ART. II. THE ROMAN CHURCH POSSESSES THE FOUR POSITIVE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH

§ I. The Roman Church Possesses Unity

32. **A.** She Is One in Her Doctrine. If we traverse *the earth from end to end,* we shall hear chanted and professed the same Creed by all whom the Church regards as her children; all admit the same principles, the same Sacrifice, the same Sacraments. If we ascend *the course of ages,* even to Apostolic times, we see the same identical doctrine professed by the Faithful throughout Christendom.

Moreover, the Church possesses *a principle* which necessarily *preserves* this unity of doctrine. She professes as an essential dogma that all men are bound to accept every doctrine formally taught by her under pain of being excluded from her communion, if they remain obstinate in their error.

Remark. No one has ever been able to show that the Roman Church has ceased to teach a single dogma contained in the Apostolic writings, or that she ever admitted a doctrinal teaching in contradiction with those writings. Never has she *defined* an article of Faith without having previously proven that the Apostles had taught it either in writing or by word of mouth. The Council of Nicea (A.D. 325), for instance, did not create the dogma of the divinity of Jesus Christ when it defined against the Arians the *Consubstantiality* of the Word, no more than the Council of Trent created the dogma of Eucharistic *Transubstantiation* when it defined it against the Protestants, who either denied it or perverted its nature. On the contrary, it is just because these doctrines were always believed by the Church that these Councils have been enabled to define them. Thus, when a few years ago the Church declared as articles of Faith the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary (1854) and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff (1870), she did not add new articles to her doctrines; they are simply *subsequent developments* of the truths revealed by Jesus Christ, and taught from the beginning by the Church. They are truths *implicitly contained in the deposit of revelation,* which have been *brought into greater light,* the better to confound the adversaries of the ancient Faith and preserve the Faithful from pernicious errors.

If dogma is unchangeable as truth is unchangeable, this immutability does not exclude *progress.* This progress in the Church is nothing else than the development of the principles laid down by Jesus Christ. Thus, for instance, the Church has declared or defined in three different Councils that there are in Jesus Christ one Person, two Natures and two Wills. These three definitions are but the logical development of the same truth, which in its primitive and revealed form has been known and taught at all times, that is, Jesus Christ is at one and the same time true God and true man.

The following observations will enable the reader to understand still better how doctrine is developed in the Church.

1. There exists in revelation a certain number of points which, from the first day of Christianity, have been formally

and explicitly put forth for the belief of the Faithful, and proposed to their acceptance.

2. There are others, which originally were not explicitly so put forth, and which were destined, in the plan of Providence, to reach progressively the light in the course of time and under the direction of authority.

3. These last include in their history three different periods. In the first, they are scarcely noticed, either because of their metaphysical depth, which accounts for the fact that their connection with principles formally revealed is not immediately perceived, or because of circumstances which do not permit every institution to manifest itself from the first day of its existence, or from the very impossibility, natural to the human mind, of thinking of everything at the same time.

In the second period, these truths, which were, as it were, slumbering in the depths of the Christian conscience, begin to be discussed. People are more struck with their significance than they were previously; they are preached, they become new food for the piety of the Faithful. It then happens that some individuals will contest them, alleging the obscurity of Tradition, and end by denying that they should be considered as forming part of the deposit of divine revelation.

In the third period, authority steps in, raises them to the rank of articles of Faith, and decides that they were originally contained in revelation.—Abbé A. Pirenne, "Etudes philosophiques" (Philosophical Studies), No. 47. See Cardinal Franzelin, "De divina scriptura et traditione."

33. "The Catholic Faith is no mere aggregation of theological decisions, but an organic body of truths, explaining, confirming and perfecting one another. Times and circumstances may concentrate the mind of the Church on one of these truths rather than on another, and thus give it universal prominence. Or controversy and heresy may necessitate clear, definite, formulated decisions of the Faith. At another time the very devotions of the Faithful will evolve precise statements of doctrine. But in all this the *explicit* declarations are but the unfolding of the implicit tenets of revelation. This 'Development of Doctrine,' or as it is technically called in

theology, 'Explication of Christian Doctrine,' must, from the nature of the case, ever be going on. It permits us to say with St. Vincent of Lerins (A.D. 450), 'we hold that which has been believed *everywhere, always, and by all;* for this is what is truly and properly Catholic. And this we shall do if we follow *universality, antiquity* and *consent.*' The same distinguished writer explains his thought by the following concluding remark: 'But some will say, shall we have no advancement of religion in the Church of Christ? Surely let us have the greatest that may be. Yes, let there be progress in the Church of Christ; but in such a way that there shall be true development, but no change of Faith. Let the revealed truths receive evidence, light, discrimination, but preserve, at the same time, their holiness, their integrity, their peculiarity.'—Common., n. 23." (See Mgr. Capel, preface to "Faith of Catholics," vol. I; Brownson, vol. XIV, p. 126.)

34. **B.** The Roman Church Is One in Her Ministry. Nothing is more evident and easier to ascertain. Unity of Faith, which we have just proven to exist, is preserved in the Church by a ministry which belongs to her alone, is unique, invariable and perfectly well known. The action of this ministry, kind and firm (*fortiter et suaviter*) at the same time, comes from Rome, the center of government, and goes by the intermediary Bishops and subordinate pastors across all the regions of the globe, to reach even the least of the members who compose the Church. The ordinary Faithful are united to their immediate pastors; these to their Bishops; the Bishops, in communion together, are united to the Pope, from whom they derive all their jurisdictional powers. This is reducing the most complicated multiplicity to the most wonderful unity. Here also there exists a principle which preserves this unity; for whosoever refuses to submit to the authority of the legitimate pastors is excluded from the bosom of the Church.

This unity of ministry, or of government, which we admire in our day, history shows us to have existed in the long series of past centuries since the dawn of the Christian era. She is unchangeable, because she is a divine institution. We

cannot say the same as to *disciplinary laws,* established, as they have been, by *ecclesiastical* authority; these may vary according to circumstances. Prudence itself requires that they be changed or abolished according to the requirements of the times. Worship may also undergo certain minor modifications as to accessory rites or ceremonies, though it ever remains the same in essential things established by Jesus Christ. "*Semper eadem*" is her proud but legitimate boast. ("The Church of Christ the Same Forever," by D. McErlane, S.J., B. Herder.)

35. Objection. At the time of the great Schism of the West, from A.D. 1378 to 1417, there were two Popes, and in 1409 even three. In the earlier period of the Schism, viz., up to the election of Alexander V in the Council of Pisa, there were in the Church two rival *obediences,* as they were called. On one side we see Pope Urban VI and his successors at Rome; on the other side there was Clement VII and likewise his successor, residing at Avignon in France. Some of the Catholic nations submitted to Urban VI, others to Clement VII. Was not the Church thus deprived, for nearly forty years, of the unity of government which is held to be an essential mark or note by which to recognize the true Church of Christ?

36. Answer. To give a complete and satisfactory answer to this difficulty, we deem it advisable to point out briefly the cause or origin of this so-called Schism of the West, and indicate the personages that figured in the rival contest for the Chair of Peter. The high position which the Papacy occupied in the society of the middle ages caused sovereigns to strive by all means to appropriate its influence to themselves. France, we must acknowledge, had deserved by real services the consideration and regard shown her; unhappily she did not know how to use them with sufficient moderation. Her preponderance in the Sacred College became excessive, and in the year 1306 a French Pope, Clement V, fixed his seat at Avignon in France. His successors imitated him, to the great displeasure of a considerable part of Christendom, especially of the Romans. Soon two parties were formed, the one advo-

cating the Pope's return to Rome, the other his permanent establishment in France; and this gave rise to the election of two simultaneously reigning Popes, viz., Urban VI in Rome and Clement VII at Avignon. Their respective successors were as follows: In Rome—Urban VI, 1378; Boniface IX, 1389; Innocent VII, 1404; Gregory XII, 1406; Alexander V, 1409; John XXIII, 1410. At Avignon—Clement VII, 1378; Benedict XIII, 1394.

The Schism would have been crushed at the outset had not France upheld the cause of Clement VII, who went to reside at Avignon. The influence of France prevailed with the nations accustomed to yield to her political sway, as the Queen of Naples and the Kings of Cyprus and Scotland. To these nations only did the authority of the anti-pope extend, notwithstanding all the proclamations and decrees of the University of Paris to the contrary.

Regarding the important question as to which side enjoyed the legitimate succession of Sovereign Pontiffs, we feel that we can hardly err in following in this particular, as in all others, the usage of the Roman Church. We learn from official documents that she has registered on the roll of Sovereign Pontiffs the names of those who sat at Rome during the period of dissension, placing among the anti-popes the two Pontiffs of Avignon. But independently of the principle of authority, the facts of history amply justify the opinion which we adopt. Urban VI was elected in Rome on April 9, 1378, and acknowledged as lawful Pope by all the Churches of the Catholic world. The Cardinals who had elected him also took part in the ceremony of his coronation, and gave notice of his election to all the princes of Christendom, and in particular to the Cardinals who had remained behind at Avignon. Their words were as follows: "On the feast of Pentecost, at the very same hour, when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, we, *acting undoubtedly under the guidance of the same Spirit, by a free and unanimous vote,* chose the Archbishop of Bari, a man of great virtue and merit." In view of this open admission, Urban VI was the legitimate Pope, and

consequently the election which these same Cardinals made of Clement VII several months later (Sept. 21, 1378) was illegitimate, and could not be justified on any ground.

The point at issue, then, might be summed up in the question: Was the election of Urban VI canonical or not? In reply to the repeated protests of the French canonists, the Oxford theologians brought it to a triumphant conclusion. Their leading arguments were the following:

39. (1) It is alleged that the election was not free; but the Roman people did not limit the choice of the Conclave to any particular individual. They demanded only, and not without reason, that the Pope should be a Roman; and the Cardinals did not even yield to this demand, but chose a Neapolitan of whom the people had never thought before. They cannot, therefore, complain that they were forced to promote a man not of their own choice.

(2) When the Archbishop of Bari was informed of his election, he resolutely refused the honor offered to him. The Cardinals entreated him to yield to their prayers. If the election had not before been free, it certainly became so then. Instead of recalling it, the Cardinals confirmed it by their entreaties. They cannot complain that Urban VI was raised to the Papal chair against their will.

(3) The Cardinals crowned the new Pope. Even those who had left Rome returned for the ceremony. How could they have spontaneously returned to crown a Pope whom they had not elected?

(4) If there was any violence, it was only during one night; whereas for three whole months the Cardinals remained quietly with Urban VI, received Holy Communion from his hand, pledged him their fidelity, sought and received his favors. The people did not stand in arms around the Pontifical palace during these three months. The Cardinals were then free; they freely communicated with Urban VI as rightful Pope.

(5) There is but one alternative; either the Cardinals knew and believed that Bartholomew Prignano, Urban VI, was Pope, or they knew and believed that he was not. If, in

their belief, Prignano was Pope, why did they elect Clement VII? If he was not Pope, why did they acquaint all Christendom with his election as legitimate? If the notification was a lie, they tried to deceive all the Holy Church of God; from that time forth their testimony must, therefore, of justice and necessity become worthless.

To us these arguments seem conclusive; nor do we know that they have as yet been answered. Thus it is that in our view of the case, as in the judgment of the Roman Church, Urban VI was the rightful Sovereign Pontiff and Clement VII an anti-pope. Consequently the successors of Urban VI in Rome were the legitimate Popes, whilst those of Clement VII at Avignon were illegitimate. (See Darras, "General History of the Catholic Church," vol. III, pp. 537–538.)

38. But peace and concord were finally restored to the Church at the General Council of Constance convened by the lawful Pope John XXIII, when through the resignation of the rival claimants, John XXIII and Gregory XII, of Rome, and the deposition of Benedict XIII, of Avignon, the Holy See was considered vacant, and Martin V was elected Pope, Nov. 11, 1417, and recognized by all Christendom as the legitimate successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ. From this historical exposition it evidently appears that the series of legitimate Supreme Pontiffs was not interrupted, and that consequently neither the unity of authority nor that of government ceased to exist, even during the period of dissension *incorrectly* called the *Western Schism.* In fact, "Schismatics," says St. Thomas (2a, 2æ, q. xxxix, a. 1), "in the strict sense, are those who of their own will and intention sever themselves from the unity of the Church; who consequently refuse to be under the Supreme Pontiff." Now here there was no real schism among the nations of Christendom, though divided in their opinion regarding the legitimate successor of St. Peter. This division of judgment regarded the rights of the different rival Popes, but not the dogma of the primacy of St. Peter and the Unity of the Apostolic See. All believed in one visible Head of the Church, but under existing circumstances, and the uncertainty and confusion caused by con-

tending parties, they did not know which was the true Pope. It was quite possible for those on either side to be in good faith and safety of conscience, though they might, in inculpable ignorance, be adherents of the illegitimately elected Pope. Hence we are justified in asserting that the sad division here referred to should not be called a *schism,* because the number of obediences did not impair the principle of Unity, since all the Churches equally held, as an article of Faith, that there was but one only Roman Church, and one only Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, who was indeed for each one of them the Pontiff they respectively acknowledged; and not several Roman Churches and several Sovereign Pontiffs. The variety of claims to authority, then, divided Christianity only upon a *matter of form,* not upon a *fundamental point* of law and doctrine.

39. Hence this schism, which is explained by an error as to a question not of *principle* but of *fact,* far from weakening our thesis, proves on the contrary the deeply rooted spirit of unity which animated the members of the whole Church. No one admitted the simultaneous existence of two legitimate heads; everyone was convinced that, according to the divine institution of the Papacy, there was and there could be but one Head to the Church founded by Christ. But who was at that time this sole Head of the Church? Evidently a part of Christendom was mistaken in its preference; but it was mistaken in good faith, and the Faithful could be in perfect security of conscience under either obedience.

40. Whilst deploring these unfortunate dissensions, we must say that never did the Church appear more admirable than during that fearful tempest, which so violently shook and tossed to and fro the bark of Peter; never did she more splendidly show that none but a divine hand was at the helm. Had the Roman Catholic Church been a purely human institution, she must inevitably have fallen at a juncture when all the resources of genius, the powers of intellect, the united endeavors of learned doctors, the combined authority of Christian princes, and even the efforts of the very Saints were powerless to abate the raging storm. An uncompromising

opponent of the Papacy (Gregorovius, VI, 3rd ed., p. 620) was candid enough to acknowledge "that any secular kingdom would have perished; yet so marvellous was the organization of this spiritual dynasty, and so indestructible the idea of the Papacy, that the schism only served to demonstrate its indivisibility."

§ II. The Roman Church Possesses Sanctity

41. The Roman Church is holy in her *final purpose,* which is the sanctification of souls. She is holy in the *means* she employs, in her *dogmas,* which are assailed only because of their sublimity, and because many of them, as to their essence, are above the powers of human reason, though not contrary to it; in her *morality,* honored by the homage of her opponents themselves, a morality which proscribes every vice, teaches every virtue, and rises to the perfection of the Evangelical Counsels; holy in her *Sacraments,* abundant sources of grace and sanctification; in her *worship,* the most *purely spiritual* that ever existed, and absolutely free from every cruel or superstitious practice. And finally, she is holy in the multitude of her *members,* who faithfully follow her instructions, and those alone depart from holiness and are slaves to sin who refuse to conform to her moral teachings and injunctions.

42. Who can count the legions of Saints engendered by the Roman Church? Not to speak of the Christian heroes of the first centuries, where shall there be found, outside of this Church, men who could compare to Saints like Benedict, Thomas Aquinas, Francis of Assisi, Ignatius of Loyola, Francis Xavier, Vincent de Paul, Francis de Sales, Elizabeth of Hungary, Teresa, and an infinity of others? Besides the many Saints of every century, raised to the honor of the altars by canonization, Saints who had no other Faith but that of Rome, and whom Rome alone can claim as her children, there is an infinite number of other members of the Church who have sanctified themselves by virtues no less real, though hidden to the eyes of men. Even to this day, in the midst of

the world's corruption, there are performed, under the same divine inspiration, as many good works and acts of virtue as during preceding centuries.

This eminent sanctity of the heroes of the Roman Church God Himself has been pleased, at all times, to proclaim and manifest to the world *by the most wonderful miracles.* These prodigies, which can only be attributed to divine intervention (see nn. 205-214, Vol. I), are so well attested by undeniable testimony, that to doubt them would be rejecting history, and even renouncing reason itself.

43. For many centuries the examination of the reality of miracles has been reserved to the Pope; we find in the Capitularies of Charlemagne the prohibition even against publishing one of them before the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff. No one is ignorant of the rigorous severity with which the Sacred Congregation of Rites, under the direction of the Sovereign Pontiff, proceeds in cases of canonization and the examination of miracles. And yet, how many miracles have been authentically proven within the last centuries! Let us cite among others those of St. Francis Xavier, St. Joseph of Cupertino, St. Philip Neri, St. Francis de Sales. The learned Pope Benedict XIV, in the appendices of his great work on the canonization of saints, relates the striking miracles of some of them, of St. Elizabeth of Portugal, St. Pius V, St. Andrew Avellino, St. Felix de Cantalice, St. Catherine of Bologna, etc. The "Acta Sanctorum," a gigantic monument erected to the glory of the Saints by the Jesuit Bollandists, would amply suffice to prove the continuity of this divine testimony in favor of the Catholic Church.

44. If there are not as many miracles in our day as in the first days of the Church, we have already given the reason. Let us not forget, moreover, *that the miracles of the early times retain for us their force as proofs,* for they are grounded upon sure and certain testimony. To-day, as then, they proclaim the sanctity of *that* Church in whose favor they were performed, and they show that God gives His most manifest approval to virtues practiced by members sheltered within her pale. Finally, the preservation of the Church and the mar-

vellous effects which she continues to produce in the world are true miracles, which become more striking as the centuries roll onward. (See nn. 254, 258, Vol. I.) Besides, our own century has been the witness of divine marvels. Who can deny it? It suffices for the most exacting critic to read the life of the venerable Curé of Ars and the interesting "History of Notre Dame de Lourdes," by Henri Lasserre, as well "Les Episodes," of the same author, to be convinced that the power of God still remains with the children of His Church. (See n. 257.)

References. 1. A. J. Thébaud, S.J., "The Church and the Moral World—Consideration on the Holiness of the Church"; Benziger Bros., New York, 1881; a masterpiece on the subject.

2. "The Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century," edited by John P. M. Schleuter, S.J.; Benziger Bros., New York, 1902.

§ III. The Roman Church Possesses Catholicity

45. The Roman Church is Catholic in time and space; she alone has always been designated by that glorious name. Already in the days of St. Augustine the name of Catholic indicated exclusively those who belonged to the Roman Church, and at all times the Faithful could say with reason: Christian is my name, Catholic is my surname. We are here reminded of St. Patrick's orthodox advice to the Irish people: *Ut Christiani, ita et Romani sitis.* As you are Christian, so be also Roman. (In Lib. Armo.) The several reasons why the Church is called Catholic or Universal are clearly set forth by our Lord, speaking to His Apostles (Matt. 28, 19-20): "*Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.*" According to these words of Christ, the Church was to spread throughout the *whole* world, she was to teach *all* truth, and to last throughout *all* time. Here Catholicity, therefore, is three-

fold—Catholicity of extension, Catholicity of doctrine, Catholicity of duration.

Since she took possession of the world by the three thousand men of every tongue converted by St. Peter at Jerusalem (Acts 2, 41), the Church has not ceased to spread and win to her fold new children in every corner of the globe. The reader should here recall what we have said about the rapid propagation of the Gospel throughout the whole world. (See n. 248.)

Already at the close of the first century the Church had passed the limits of the Roman Empire, and from that time she has never ceased to gain ground among the most barbarous nations of the earth, accustomed, as she was, to recover in one country what she lost in another, and always seeing the marvellous fruitfulness of her youth renewed in some part or other of the world. St. Francis Xavier alone gained more converts to the Roman Catholic Church in India and Japan than were lost to her allegiance in Europe by the Protestant Reformation.

And in our day this fruitfulness strikes all observers. If we pass in review the most distant countries, the most obscure islands of the ocean, we will find Catholics everywhere. The Roman Church is not only spread throughout all the countries of the world, but it greatly surpasses in numbers each of the other Christian denominations. (See Fourth Conference of Lacordaire.)

§ IV. The Roman Church Possesses Apostolicity

46. **A.** The Roman Church Goes Back to the Apostles by Her Doctrine. This doctrine is to-day the same as that of the Apostles; between the most ancient creeds or symbols of Faith, between the writings and decisions of the first centuries and those of our times, the identity is complete. This we have proven when speaking of unity of doctrine in the Roman Church. (nn. 16–19.)

Protestants claim, it is true, that after the first centuries the Roman Church *created* new dogmas, for instance that of

the Real Presence, the existence of Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints. But it is not enough to assert, *proof* must be given: let them say *when, how* and *by whom* were these dogmas introduced into the Church. This they have never done, and very naturally. Meanwhile, that which they assert without proof, the Church has a right simply to deny, because she is in possession, *quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur,* as logicians say. Proofs, however, are not wanting to show that there has been no change in her belief. We have seen with what zeal Popes and Bishops from the very commencement constantly opposed every doctrinal innovation. They would, therefore, have been equally opposed to the introduction of the important dogmas objected to by the Protestants. But they have not done so, as ecclesiastical history, always so careful in matters of that kind, is silent as to that point. Undoubtedly no one will venture to say that all the members of the Church, pastors and flock, in all parts of the world, agreed together at a given moment to admit such numerous and very serious innovations. Even if this had been possible, the heretics of the time would not have failed to raise their voices; condemned, as they themselves were, by the Church as innovators, they would have eagerly seized the occasion to retort the argument and reproach the Church herself with the very innovations that she reproved in others. (n. 33.)

47. **B.** The Roman Catholic Church Goes Back to the Apostles by the uninterrupted succession of her lawful rulers. History shows in the See of St. Peter an unbroken line of 261 legitimate Pontiffs. All the Popes have called themselves and proclaimed to the world that they were the successors of the Chief of the Apostles and the inheritors of his supreme authority. The Churches which are subordinate to the Church of Rome and form with her a united whole offer also a series of pastors, deriving their mission from the Apostolic See.

Objection. The legitimate succession of the Roman Pontiffs has been many times interrupted by schisms, and by the long sojourn of the Popes at Avignon from 1306 to 1417.

Answer. These facts, as it has been shown above (nn.

36–40), have in no way interrupted the legitimate succession of the supreme heads of the Roman Church.

(1) During the schism there was always one legitimate Pope, though his legitimacy may have been contested in good faith or through ignorance by a part of the Church. Does the revolt of a province prevent a prince from continuing to be the legitimate sovereign of that province, which in good or bad faith rejects his authority? As to the great Schism of the West, we have already spoken at sufficient length concerning it (nn. 36–40).

(2) As the residence of a prince outside of the capital of his kingdom does not deprive him of the sovereignty over his legitimate dominions, so the residence of the Popes at Avignon did not prevent them from being *Bishops of Rome,* and, *as such,* heads of the whole Church till the days of Clement VII and Benedict XIII, who were anti-popes.

Conclusion of Article II

48. (1) In the nineteenth century, in the days in which we live, as well as in the past, the Roman Church is *One*: (*a*) All her members, though of all tongues, and political parties, and forms of government, are united in closest communion under the visible Head, who, together with the Episcopate held by the successors of the Apostolic College—the Bishops dispersed through the whole world, whom the Holy Ghost appoints—rules and governs this body politic, this living organization. (*b*) There is *one* and the same principle of Faith, namely divine authority and testimony for *one* body of doctrines held by her pastors and people individually and collectively. (*c*) There is *one* sacramental system and worship, receiving the same explanation and producing the same effects in the possession of all her children.

(2) The Roman Church is *Holy:* (*a*) Because her doctrine is in itself holy, ever inviting men to ascend higher and higher in virtue. (*b*) She is *holy* because she has begotten a mighty army of heroic Saints and Martyrs, and Virgins. On every soil has she planted and founded institutions, created and directed by those who, wishing to be perfect, give up home

and wealth to labor for their Master in saving souls. (*c*) She is *holy* because, consumed by the desire to enkindle the fire of divine love on earth, she is instant in season and out of season in preaching the Gospel to those who are in sin or in darkness. The glory of converting pagan nations is hers. This, no Protestant sect, backed by illimitable wealth or the greatest political power, has even been able to accomplish. (See "Christian Missions," by T. W. M. Marshall.)

(3) The Roman Church is *Catholic*: (*a*) Because she is of no one nation; her constitution and her teachings are fitted to all peoples and forms of government. (*b*) Because her principle of Faith is applicable to all, young and old, learned and unlearned. (*c*) Because her continuity and identity of existence from Pentecost day till now can be plainly traced. (*d*) Because she alone has the whole of revelation—the Faith once delivered to the Saints. Circumstances have obliged her to formulate the Faith in dogmatic decisions and creeds so as to bear witness to what is contained in the *deposit* of Faith; but such authoritative declarations are no additions to the Faith, they do but unwrap what it contains and explicitly expose its separate doctrines. (See nn. 16–21.) (*e*) Because she admits of no rival; she is ever vigilant, condemning schism and heresy; by friend and by foe she is known as The Catholic Church.

(4) The Roman Catholic Church is *Apostolic*: (*a*) Because she teaches identically the same doctrines taught by the Apostles; and (*b*) because her ministers derive their powers from the Apostolic See by an uninterrupted succession of lawful pastors, each one of whom is able, if need be, to trace back his ordination, or the episcopal consecration and the power of jurisdiction to the Apostolic body established by Christ nearly nineteen centuries ago.

The Church which is called Catholic and Roman is the only Church whose line of Pontiffs and prelates and priests runs back to the beginning. Two hundred and sixty-one Popes, from St. Peter to Pius XI, have occupied the See of Rome. There is nothing to obscure or invalidate their title to the Apostolic See. As Leo XIII, followed Pius IX, and

the latter Gregory XVI, so all the rest back to the first century, when Clement succeeded Cletus, and Cletus Linus, and Linus Peter, to whom Christ said: *"Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* The vigilance of the Church at every ordination, and at the consecration of every Bishop, makes doubt impossible concerning the valid succession of pastors. Besides, her bitterest adversaries cannot gainsay her claim to Apostolicity. No time later than that of the Apostles can be assigned as her origin, nor can one break be pointed out in her Orders or mission. All this is so evident that Apostolicity is not only a property of that Church, but it stands out also as a mark that identifies her with the Church founded by Christ.

The Roman Church then possesses all the notes or marks of the true Church; and as Jesus Christ founded but one Church, it follows that the Roman Church is truly the identical Church established by the Redeemer of the World, the Church appointed to guide men to the attainment of their last happy destiny, eternal happiness in the world to come.

CHAPTER III

PROTESTANTISM DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST

49. Remark. After the preceding demonstration, the two chapters which follow might appear superfluous. We add them, nevertheless, as a superabundant proof, and especially to facilitate the return of our separated brethren wandering in the ways of error to the fold of the Savior, who alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life, and who so ardently desires that there be but one fold under the guidance of one shepherd. (John 10, 16.)

There is in our day but one important heresy, Protestantism. We include under this general name every belief which, holding to Christian revelation, protests against the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, and appeals to the Scriptures as the only source of revealed truth. In reality

Protestantism is not a definite religion. The numberless sects, which bear its name, have between each other no other bond than this negative name, which suits every heresy; they have no other principle of life but the dogmas and precepts which they have taken from the Catholic Church, the Church from which they separated—the scattered remnants of Faith which they have retained as parts of their belief. (See "The Religion of Protestants," in "Thoughts for all Times" by Mgr. John S. Vaughan; O'Shea & Co., New York, 1899.)

50. Historical Notice. We shall at first say a few words about the authors of Protestantism.

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, in Saxony, in 1483. He embraced monastic life in the convent of the Augustinians of Erfurt, and was sent by his superiors to the University of Wittenberg to teach theology. He there made himself remarkable especially for his love of innovations and by indomitable pride. Leo X having in 1517 entrusted the Dominicans with the publication of certain indulgences, this monk of vivid imagination and ardent character, feeling slighted probably by the prefcrence given to an Order other than his own, began violently to attack what he called abuses and exaggeration of speech in the preachers of the indulgences. It was not long before he was carried away into attacking the institution of indulgences themselves, as well as the power of granting them; then urged on as he was by the logical consequences of a false principle, he passed from one error to another. Even at that time we find already formulated in his writings and sermons to the people that principle which was to play such an important part in his doctrinal system: *faith alone produces the remission of sins.* It was only after long and laborious efforts made by Leo X, to bring him back to truth and obedience, that a bull of excommunication was fulminated against the rebellious monk. Far from submitting, the heresiarch caused the bull to be burned publicly at Wittenberg. From that moment the revolt was consummated, Protestantism had found its first apostle. Eight years after his revolt, in 1525, Martin Luther married an ex-nun named Catherine Bora, and died in 1546. See Audin, "Vie de Luther" (Life of Luther); "Vie de Cal-

vin'' (Life of Calvin); ''Histoire de Léon X'' (History of Leo X); Janssen, ''L'Allemagne et la Réforme'' (Germany and the Reformation), vol. 2; Lorrenz, ''La Fin de Luther'' (The Death of Luther).

Shortly after Luther, *Zwinglius* began to dogmatize in Switzerland, and *Calvin* at Geneva. Their doctrines are far from being the same as Luther's, but they agree in contradicting openly the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and in allowing much freedom and ease to the unruly lower passions.

As to *Henry VIII,* King of England, it is known how, after having written a book against Luther, and even after soliciting and obtaining the title of Defender of the Faith, he dragged his people into schism. His purpose was to be free to gratify his lust and satisfy his unruly passions. As the Pope, Clement VII, refused to second his criminal desires by authorizing the divorce from Catherine of Aragon, his lawful wife, he broke with the Roman Church and had himself proclaimed head of the Anglican Church (1534). As was only to be expected, it was not long before heresy was engrafted upon his schism.

Without further insisting upon these well-known facts, we shall now proceed to show that Protestantism has *none of the positive marks* of the true Church of Jesus Christ.

§ I. Protestantism Is Absolutely Devoid of Unity, Either in Doctrine or in Ministry or Government

Protestant divines, realizing the fact that none of their manifold denominations possess any of the four marks or notes of the Church founded by Christ, have discarded such notes and replaced them by two others applicable to and accepted by any sect. They are, first, the truth of the doctrine they teach, and, secondly, the legitimate administration of the Sacraments they admit. However, whilst devising these new rules to prop and uphold the tottering fabric of the Reformation, they forgot their logic, and fell into the sophism of *petitio principii*—begging the question at issue. For they

gratuitously assume the very thing that is to be ascertained, namely which religious society holds the true doctrine taught by Christ and His Apostles, and what community possesses the legitimate administration of the Sacraments which He instituted. The truth of revealed doctrine is to be learned from authorized teachers, who must first be known from some characteristic marks, a fact which, in the Catholic system, is accomplished by the application of the four notes of Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity and Apostolicity, as was done in the preceding chapter.

Moreover, the truth of the doctrine and of the legitimate administration of the Sacraments are things in themselves invisible, that must be made known by some extrinsic proof or marks, which are precisely those furnished by the Symbol of Faith or Creed of the first General Council of Constantinople. The learned as well as the illiterate see the bearing of the aforesaid marks as an easy, popular means of finding the true Church founded by Christ. Hence we may here apply the words of the prophet Isaias: "*And a path and a way shall be there, and it shall be called the holy way . . . and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools* (the ignorant, the illiterate) *shall not err therein.*" (35, 15.)

51. **A.** It Does Not Possess Unity of Doctrine. (1) The first Founders of Protestantism were, at its very origin, *in complete disagreement* as to matters of belief, and these doctrinal divergences have only gone on increasing from that time. Among their disciples, their dissensions have multiplied to such an extent that it may be said almost literally that the diversity of beliefs equalled that of individuals: *quot capita tot sententiæ* (as many opinions as there are heads). Luther himself had to admit it as early as 1525: "There are almost as many sects and beliefs as there are heads," he wrote; "this one will not admit Baptism, that one rejects the Sacrament of the Altar, another places another world between the present one and the day of judgment, some teach that Jesus Christ is not God. There is not an individual, however clownish he may be, who does not claim to be inspired by the Holy Ghost, and who does not put forth as prophecies his ravings and dreams."

The number of sects which have freed themselves from every dependence on each other cannot be counted. According to official reports there are now in the United States of America fifty-six *principal* sects; by adding secondary sects we have 288 sects. "Whitaker's Almanac" for 1895 enumerates 274 religious denominations in England alone. In the single city of London and its suburbs we find more than one hundred different sects. In each sect professions of Faith follow each other as leaves on a tree; hence a Protestant minister of Kiel, Harms, has said that he would engage to write on his thumb-nail all the doctrines still uniformly admitted among Protestants. The following is a list of some Protestant sects in the United States of America: Adventist, Baptist (Regular), Free-will Baptist, Seventh-Day Baptist, German Seventh-Day Baptist, Free Communion Baptist, Anti-Mission Baptist, Six-Principles Baptist, Catholic Apostolic Church (not Roman), Christian, Christian Connection, Christian Perfectionist, Church of God, Congregationalist Unitarian, Congregationalist, Disciples (Campbellites), African Methodist, Zion African Methodist, Methodist Episcopal (South), Free Methodist, Western Primitive Methodist, Independent Methodist, Moravians (Unitas Fratrum), Mormon, New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian), Presbyterian (Regular), Presbyterian (Old School), Presbyterian (New School), Presbyterians (Associated and United), Reformed Church (late Dutch Reformed), Dunkers, Episcopal (Protestant), Evangelical Association, Friends or Quakers, Hicksites, Lutheran, Mennonites, Methodist, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Methodist Church, Reformed Mennonites, River Brethren, Shakers, Spiritualist, True Wesleyan, United Brethren in Christ, Universalist. Here we are confronted with a veritable sea of confusion and listening to a perfect babel of conflicting tongues.

(2) Not only were the first Reformers far from agreeing as to religious beliefs, but *each* one of them would *change his opinions without any hesitation,* rejecting and accepting by turns the same beliefs, according to the requirements of the moment. Luther went so far as to threaten his followers on several occasions that he would retract all his innovations, if

they persisted in raising trouble. According to Melanchthon, the most moderate of the Reformers, "Articles of Faith must be frequently changed, and made to accord with time and circumstances."

(3) These variations in beliefs among all the founders of Protestantism, and since their time, should not surprise anyone; they are the *necessary consequence* of the Protestant rule of Faith, that is, of the principle which determines and decides their beliefs, for Protestants reject the Catholic principle of authority of the Church, divinely commissioned to determine what are the inspired *Scriptures* and authentic *Traditions,* and authorized to interpret them in an infallible manner. According to Protestants, it is the Bible alone, interpreted by individual reason, which should make known to each person what he is obliged to believe. One can easily foresee the inevitable consequences of such a destructive principle. The poet's saying is here literally verified:

> In Religion,
> What damned error, but some sober brow
> Will bless it, and approve it with a text?
> —*Merchant of Venice,* Act III, sc. 2.

Protestants soon arrived at the stage of rejecting as apocryphal many books of the Old and even of the New Testament, and already in his day Bossuet had ample materials for writing his masterpiece entitled "L'Histoire des variations protestantes" (History of Protestant Variations).

52. *Worship* being but the *expression of Faith—forma precandi est lex credendi*—and diversity of belief necessarily bringing about diversity of religious rites and ceremonies, it was inevitable that there should be introduced into Protestantism a great variety of practices as to the Sacraments, Sacrifice and prayer. Thus some admit this particular Sacrament, others reject it, and among those who admit it, some understand it in one way, others in another. Luther, for instance, reduced the number of Sacraments from seven to two. Moreover, according to the Lutheran idea, they do not produce *interior* sanctification. Justification consists not in the fact

that sin is effaced, but that it is covered by faith in the merits of Jesus Christ. As to the Eucharist, some admit the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the consecrated Host, others only see in it a figure of Him. Unable to resist the clearness of the sacred texts which affirm this presence, Luther wished nevertheless to introduce a radical change in this Catholic dogma. According to his new doctrine, the body and blood of Jesus Christ do not become present by the *changing* of the elements of bread and wine, viz., by *transubstantiation*, but they are there *with* the bread and wine and *under* them. Moreover, according to him, Jesus Christ is present only *at the moment* that the Eucharist is *received;* this Sacrament, he says, was instituted *only for use,* and not in any way to be at the same time a true external and visible *Sacrifice.* In his eyes, the Mass is an abominable idolatry. As to Jesus Christ Himself, some acknowledge Him as God, others refuse to adore Him. The different ways of administering the Sacraments are not less numerous. Finally, some pray for the dead, others do not; and whilst all Catholics pray for each other, and also for heretics, schismatics, Jews and infidels, we see nothing similar in the dissenting sects.

53. Remark. We admit that in reality the greater number of Protestants follow any minister who possesses the art of commanding their attention, and whose opinions unite a certain number of supporters. But besides the fact that such an authority is purely human, and that it is contrary to the fundamental principle of Protestantism, private interpretation of the Bible, it is impossible under such a system to avoid diversity of belief. Why, indeed, should ministers be more in accord with each other than the simple Faithful themselves?

It is also true that, to preserve a shadow of unity, certain Protestants have recourse to formulas of Faith, to symbols and to synodal decrees. Already Luther, acting contrary to his fundamental rule of Faith, composed a catechism and made it obligatory on all his followers. Much more, he dared to write the following words, and others of a like nature: "There is no angel in heaven, and much less no man on earth, who can and who will dare judge *my* doctrine. Whosoever shall not

adopt it, cannot be saved; whosoever believes otherwise than I, is doomed to hell. Whosoever receives not my doctrine cannot attain salvation." Is it possible to contradict more formally the doctrine of *private interpretation?* Under such conditions, it would have been better, many Protestants very rightly said to themselves, to have remained subject to the great and ancient authority of the Church of Rome.

Conclusion. It is evident, the absence of unity of Faith is an absolutely incurable wound with Protestants. There are *Protestant sects,* but there is not, and there cannot be, a *Protestant religion,* for the reason that there is no common Faith, no unity of doctrine.

54. **B.** Protestantism Has Not Unity of Ministry or Government. Each sect, for the very reason that it has its own belief apart, is independent of all others; moreover, as a fact, the ministers of one sect have not the right to meddle in the government of the others. Much more, in each particular communion, the ministers are independent of each other. It is in fact a Protestant principle that each one lawfully exercises the ministry, provided only that in its exercise he does not wander away from the doctrine of fundamental articles. But once again, as to those fundamental articles, who has the requisite authority to define them? (See n. 18.) Let us add, that according to Luther all the Faithful are priests. (See Janssen, vol. 2, p. 104.)

Who can fail to see the striking contrast between the Unity of Catholics on one side and the endless divisions of Protestants on the other? "At the present moment," says Mgr. J. S. Vaughan in "Thoughts for All Times," "the Catholic Church, though spread throughout the entire world, remains ever one integral organic whole. And why is this? Because the self-same divine voice that spoke through Peter in the council chamber of Jerusalem nearly two thousand years ago still speaks through Leo XIII. All Catholics recognize him as the mouthpiece of the infinite God, and when he pronounces a decree or defines a doctrine, two hundred and fifty millions of loyal subjects bow in cheerful, grateful obedience before him, and accept his ruling and his authority. He watches

over the whole flock. He has been appointed pastor by Christ Himself. All are bound to listen to him as to Christ in person, and who despises him, despises Christ. (Luke 10, 16.)

"When others are tossed about on the pathless sea of error, and are carried hither and thither by every wind of doctrine, we are at peace. What a contrast between the Church and the sects! Who but the stone-blind can fail to distinguish the work of God from the work of man?

"What is the bond of union among Protestants? Where is their infallible authority? The Bible. But is the Bible, when left to each one's private interpretation, a principle of unity? History and experience prove it to be precisely the reverse. It is a most prolific principle of disunion, of discord and dissension. As soon as the principle was introduced, men split up into different sections, according to the different interpretations they gave the various passages. And when they differed among themselves, who was to settle their disputes and to adjust their difficulties? Who was to preserve unity? There was no one. They recognized no living infallible voice. Each felt himself to be as good a judge as his neighbor. What was the result? Chaos. In a word, endless divisions, and the formation of a heterogeneous assembly of persons known by the extraordinary name of Protestants, not really united in one organic whole, but each following his own glimmering light—constituting an assemblage, to which courtesy extends the name of Church, but which is about as much like the Church of God as a heap of loose stones is like a cathedral."

§ II. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Holiness

55. **A.** Not in Its Founders. (1) History shows in Luther a violent, lustful, intemperate man, trampling under foot the most sacred engagements; in Calvin an impure man, cruel and vindictive; in Zwinglius a debauchee, as he himself confesses; in Henry VIII an adulterer, a wife murderer and a ruthless tyrant. The morals and the private sentiments of Luther, such as he reveals himself in his writings, could not be published without scandal. The reader may read about

his contests with the devil in Döllinger: "The Reformation," vol. 3, p. 257. The reader will also find very abundant, as well as fully authentic, information on the doings and morals of the German reformer in Stang's "Life of Martin Luther." (Pustet, New York, 1897.)

(2) These reformers authorized in their adepts the most revolting things. Luther does not dare declare in his sermons that polygamy is forbidden; and he even went so far as to permit bigamy in the case of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse; seven other reformers approved this permission, and Melanchthon assisted at this criminal union.

(3) In their writings and speeches they displayed a passionate character, a corrupt heart and intolerable pride; the least resistance was enough to make them vomit forth torrents of insults and blasphemies; in this respect the language of Luther in particular is gross to so revolting a degree that it arouses unbearable disgust. (See Janssen and Audin, in the works already cited; see also Part VIII, ch. i what we have to say as to Protestant intolerance.)

56. **B.** Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Holiness in Its Moral Doctrine. In the first place Protestantism does not possess a morality common to all and obligatory upon all, no more than it possesses a common belief binding upon all. For Protestantism, the Scriptures are the sole rule of morals, as they are the sole rule of Faith; now if every Protestant can and should interpret the Scriptures *according to the light of his reason,* each one may in consequence *form his own code of morality for himself,* without anyone else having the right to interfere. It is even permissible for everyone to *change his code of morality,* according to the ever-varying disposition of *his mind.* What I may think that I find in the Scriptures to-day, I may not find to-morrow, and my practice will change with my personal ideas.

Much more, if he believes the founders of the Reformation, the Protestant is not obliged to practice what he reads in the Scriptures even in the clearest passages. For these innovators assert that *good works are useless and even hurtful to salvation;* that *faith is sufficient* to make us friends of God; that

man, once justified before God, is sure of salvation, *no matter what crimes he may afterwards commit;* that *it is even impossible for him to sin,* for the reason that he does no longer possess free will. Luther and Calvin go so far even as to *deny the very existence of free will* in man; and the former has even written in support of this view a book entitled "De servo arbitrio," that is to say, "On the Serfdom or Slavery of the Will." The contents of this book may be summarized in the following phrase: "God performs in us evil as well as good, and as He saves us without merit on our part, so He damns us also without there being fault on our part. Everything that we do is done, not with freedom, but by pure necessity." "Works of Luther," vol. II, p. 435.

Calvin uses the same language: "For incomprehensible reasons," says he, "God excites man to violate His laws; His inspirations impel towards evil the heart of the wicked; man falls into sin because God has so ordained." (*Institut. Chrét.;* Christian Institutions—vol. VII, ch. 23.) "*God,*" says Zwinglius, "is the first principle of sin. It is by a divine necessity that man commits all crimes." (De providentia, vol. I, p. 355.)

We shall give a few more texts taken from Luther's own writings, because they speak louder than all the arguments that might be adduced: "How rich is the Christian: even if he were to wish it, he cannot be disinherited from heaven by any sin whatsoever; not to believe in the Son of God, that is the only sin possible in this world. Believe, therefore, and be certain of thy salvation." (Luther, "De captiv. Babyl.") "There is no scandal more dangerous, more poisonous, than a good life outwardly manifested by good works. Pious souls, who do good to gain heaven, not only shall never attain it, but they must be reckoned among the impious." (Works of Luther, vol. VI, p. 160.) "The Gospel does not require of us works for our justification; on the contrary, it condemns such works." "Murder, theft, are not crimes as great as the wish to enter heaven with good works, than which nothing can be more prejudicial to salvation." ("Unedited or Posthumous Sermons," published by Mack.)

57. *The uselessness of good works,* also taught by Calvin in

more than fifteen places in "Institution Chrétienne," naturally flows from the ideas which the innovators formed of justification. When man is justified, they say, no interior change takes place within him; all is summed up in a gratuitous and exterior imputation or application of the justice of Jesus Christ. The Christian becomes a just man because it pleases God to regard him as covered with the mantle of His Son's innocence. The morality of his conduct enters not at all in the conditions of the divine friendship; sin matters little, provided faith remains. "Be a sinner and sin greatly," Luther writes to his friend Melanchthon. . . . "We must sin as long as we remain in this world. . . . Sin cannot separate us from God, even if we were each day to commit a thousand adulteries and as many homicides." (Lutheri ep., Jena, 1556, vol. I, p. 545.)

Such a doctrine evidently destroys the very principle of morality. If it were true, Jesus Christ, in place of having come into the world to deliver us from sin and teach us by word and example to practice all virtues, even the most heroic, would have died to give us the liberty to live in crime with impunity!

We are not ignorant of the fact that many Protestants of our day cannot tolerate the teachings of the founders of the Reformation, and hold that the observance of the Decalogue is absolutely necessary for salvation. If, in their view, works are not the formal principle of justification, they are none the less a necessary condition, because they show a true belief, which really justifies. This attitude of many modern Protestants would simply prove that their principles and conduct are in direct opposition to those of their founders. But would this prove that the religion they received from those founders is identical with the doctrine of Jesus Christ? And that they may conscientiously continue until death to profess the creed of those Reformers? Having been compelled by the voice of reason and the testimony of an upright conscience to abandon the Reformers' teachings in the capital points referred to above (nn. 56, 57), how can they safely trust to their guidance in anything else?

58. **C.** Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of

Holiness in the Influence Which It Has Exercised upon Morals. We can easily imagine to what extremes a doctrine will lead, which puts a cruel monster, such as Marat, and the saintly Vincent de Paul on the same level. Why should man inconvenience himself, why should he not give free rein to his passions? Hence we cannot be astonished that after only a few years Calvin should write: "Among hundreds of persons calling themselves evangelicals, we can hardly find a single one, who has become an evangelical for other motive than to give himself up with more freedom to all kinds of voluptuousness and incontinence." It was not long before Luther himself becoming terrified at the fruits of his teaching, wrote: "Since Germany has seen the light of the Gospel, she appears as if possessed by the devil; . . . the fear of God has disappeared; it is a deluge of all kinds of vices." (Comment. in II Petri 2.) "Our people take the Gospel for a gastronomic doctrine, which teaches to drink and eat to the verge of bursting. This is the view of the matter now held by everybody. Who among us would have undertaken to preach it, if we had foreseen so many calamities and scandals? Now that we have begun, we must stand the consequences." "I admit," says he in another place, "that my doctrine has given birth to many scandals. I will not deny that the new order of things often makes me tremble, especially when my conscience reproaches me with having raised my arm against the order of the Church that was so quiet, so peaceful under the Papacy, and with having, by my doctrines, given birth to discord and trouble." (Luther's Works, vol. II, p. 387.)

These admissions, which we could multiply tenfold, and which can be found in Janssen's work, "Germany and the Reformation," show that God was not with the men who pretended to *reform* the Roman Church. Whilst, from the very beginning, the reformed sects incurred these bitter and well-deserved reproaches, the Fathers of the Council of Trent, assisted by the Holy Ghost, were, by rules full of wisdom and prudence, remedying effectually the abuses which had been introduced into Catholic discipline. (See Janssen, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 182, "Luther judged by himself.")

§ III. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Catholicity

59. It is clearly evident that Protestantism does not possess universality, either in *time* or *space*. In the first place, it only began in the XVIth century; then, in the countries, where it succeeded in introducing itself, even if it does bear a general name, it is in reality divided into a multitude of sects perfectly independent of and hostile to each other, separated even by their particular name, having often no other bond than their common hatred of the Catholic Church. How could they form *one* religion, when there is not and cannot be any body of truths uniformly taught everywhere among them? Uniformity of belief would indeed be the overthrow of the fundamental principle of Protestantism: the Bible freely interpreted by each individual. Finally, not only none of the divisions of Protestants approaches the Catholic Church in numbers, but the total number of the adherents of all the reformed sects is far from reaching the number of Catholics throughout the world. (See n. 45.) The following anecdote taken from the lecture of T. W. M. Marshall, entitled "Order and Chaos," will be read with interest and supply the answer to a common difficulty alleged by Protestants against Catholics:

"Some years ago, I was present officially at the examination of an English primary school, in which the Catholic children displayed such unusual accuracy and intelligence, as long as the questions turned only upon secular subjects, that I was anxious to ascertain whether they could reason as well about the truths of the Catechism, as they could about those of grammar and arithmetic. I communicated my desire to their clergyman, who kindly permitted me to have recourse to a test which I had employed on other occasions. I requested him to interrogate them on the Notes of the Church, and when they had explained in the usual manner the meaning of the word Catholic, I took up the examination, with the consent of the priest, and addressed the following question to the class: 'You say the Church is Catholic because she is everywhere.

Now I have visited many countries, in all parts of the world, and I never came to one in which I did not find heresy. If, then, the Church is Catholic because she is everywhere, why is not heresy Catholic, since heresy is everywhere also?' 'If you please, sir,' answered a little girl about twelve years of age, 'the Church is everywhere, and everywhere the *same;* heresy may be everywhere too, as you say, but it is everywhere *different.*'

"I related this incident not long after, as a proof that faith is an intellectual power, to one of the greatest lawyers in England, a man accustomed to appraise all the products of the human intellect. He declared to me his opinion that it was the most astonishing answer ever made by a child. He was wrong. I have myself heard similar answers a hundred times. And you, ladies and gentlemen, will certainly not share the surprise of this eminent lawyer, because you know that a little Catholic child, who has learned the Catechism and nothing else, is a truer and deeper philosopher, in the sight of God and the angels, than all the Pagan sages of the past, or all the Protestant doctors of the present."

§ IV. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Mark of Apostolicity

60. **A.** It Does Not Possess It by Its Doctrine. We have abundantly proven this fact. Where is the Apostolic doctrine enjoined upon the belief of all? Evidently the Apostles did not receive from Jesus Christ, nor did they transmit to their successors, the various and often contradictory opinions, which divide Protestant sects.

B. Nor Does Protestantism Possess the Mark of Apostolicity by Its Government or Its Ministry. How could the founders of Protestantism derive their authority from the Apostles, when they themselves rebelled against the *successors* of the Apostles? In truth, Luther, Calvin and the other leaders of Protestantism, feeling the necessity of justifying their revolt, claimed to have received from the Apostles their mission as Reformers; but to prove to the world that they have

been authorized to change or perfect a divine work, something more is required than a mere assertion. Jesus Christ Himself thought it necessary to give abundant proofs of His divine mission. Hence the Reformers should have offered at least some miracles to accredit themselves before the people. Luther understood very well the necessity that there was to furnish such a proof. Hence great embarrassment arose in his mind. Sometimes he would say that he held his mission from the magistrates of Wittenberg, at others from his position as a doctor. In the space of twenty-four years he changed his opinion fourteen times on that point.

The truth is that no one has received and no one shall ever receive such a mission as that of reforming divine revelation: we have seen that the Apostles had expressedly received the command to teach men to keep what Jesus Christ had confided to them; and St. Paul launched forth anathemas against any man who would dare teach another doctrine than that of the Apostles. It remains, therefore, proven, that it was by their private individual authority that these men arrogated to themselves their pretended mission, and that the Church of Jesus Christ has the right to say to them: "You are but of yesterday and I know you not."

As to the Anglicans, it is certain that their Church possesses neither the power of Orders nor the power of jurisdiction.

In the Apostolic Letter of Leo XIII, dated September, 1895, on the nullity or invalidity of Anglican Ordinations, the Holy Father sets forth most convincing reasons for his final judgment and thus puts an end, so far as Catholics are concerned, to the discussion as to the value of these Ordinations. May our separated brethren be impressed with the persuasion that they have neither priesthood, nor Sacrifice, nor the Real Presence of Jesus Christ, nor the power of imparting valid absolution! May they respond to the pressing appeal of the Supreme Pastor of souls, and return at last to the center of Catholic unity, where they will find one fold under one shepherd.

We have seen that jurisdiction is transmitted by the authority which is invested with it, and in accordance with the

canonical rules in force at the time of its transmission. To whom then do Protestant ministers succeed? From whom and how have they received jurisdiction? Surely it could not be from their first Bishops, who abandoned Catholicity to embrace the Reformation. These Bishops before their apostasy, it is true, held jurisdiction from the Church of Rome. But the subjects, which Rome had confided to them, Rome took away from them; it had the right to do the one thing as well as the other.

Conclusion. Protestantism therefore has *none of the characteristic* notes by which the Savior has marked His work; hence it is not the edifice built by the divine hand to shelter the Elect during their passage from earth to heaven, from time to eternity. When treating of the divinity of the Christian religion, in the first volume of our work, we have shown (n. 214) that a miracle is an authentic divine confirmation of the doctrine in support of which it is performed. It has also been proved that Jesus Christ and the Apostles performed many such miracles. Here we may pertinently ask: Have the founders and apostles of Protestantism any such credentials to show? We know from history the fraudulent attempt made by Calvin to work a miracle, the resurrection of a dead man, as an evidence of God's sanction and approval of the reformed Gospel he was preaching, an attempt which had a tragic end, and whose fatal termination publicly exposed the imposture of that would-be wonderworker. As this historical fact cannot but convey to our readers a most salutary and instructive lesson, we reproduce it here at full length, and with all the circumstances and details attested by those that were present at its occurrence:

The Archheretic Calvin's Miracle

61. Jerome Bolsec, a contemporary and disciple of Calvin, but later a convert to the Catholic Faith, in his life of Calvin, ch. 13, relates the following fact, which we translate from the original Latin, as found in Card. Bellarmine's "Controversies," vol. II, p. 133.

"I must not omit," says Bolsec, "his wily proceedings to

obtain for himself the credit of a holy prophet of God and worker of miracles, by pretending to raise from the dead a man called Bruleus, who was born at Ostunum. It happened as follows: Bruleus and his wife, having moved from Ostunum to Geneva, were seeking to gain the favor of Calvin in order to get a portion of the money entrusted to him for the benefit of the poor. Calvin kindly promises them assistance, if they will not refuse him their co-operation in carrying out a certain plan, for the success of which fidelity and silence were absolutely required. They, in turn, profess themselves ready to execute his commands. Calvin then instructs Bruleus to feign himself sick. The ministers in a meeting exhort the people to aid the sick man by prayers, and relieve his poverty with alms. Not long after he simulates death. Whereupon Calvin, secretly advised of it, goes out for a walk, as if entirely ignorant of the whole affair. Accompanied by a great crowd of his friends and followers he comes to the place where he can hear the cries and lamentations of the wife, for she acted to perfection the part of one stricken in sorrow and grief. Calvin asks what is the matter, enters the house and falls on his knees, together with all his retinue, and praying out loud entreats God to show his power and restore the dead man to life and thus make it evident to the whole people that he (i.e., Calvin) was God's special and beloved servant, and singularly chosen by Him for the ministry of the Gospel and the reformation of the Church. After uttering these prayers he approaches the corpse, and taking hold of the wretched man's hand, bids him in God's name arise. He repeats again, and a third time the same words, even raising his voice higher. But what happens? The dead man neither hears nor speaks nor stirs, for, by a just judgment of God, who hates deceptions, imposture and lies, he that pretended to be dead is found to be actually so. And the wife, however much she shook him and stirred him, could not make him speak or move, for he was indeed stiff and cold in death. Perceiving this she began to weep and lament in good earnest, and turning upon Calvin, called him an impostor, and an assassin, and the murderer of her husband, and in a loud voice

related the whole affair from beginning to end, thus publicly exposing the fraud of the wily Reformer; and the same writer, Jerome Bolsec, concludes his narrative by the following words: 'Let the cringing slaves and disciples of Calvin deny this fact, if they can. This tragic event was a matter of public notoriety in Geneva, where it occurred; it was testified to by many eyewitnesses, and confirmed by one of the accomplices of the fraud, the wife of the wretched dead impostor himself. As Tertullian (A.D. 240) in his work 'De præscriptione,' pertinently remarks, 'Apostolic men raised the dead to life—impostors cause the living to die—*Illi enim de mortuis suscitabant: isti de vivis mortuos faciunt.*' "

§ V. In Its Rule of Faith Protestantism Contradicts Jesus Christ

62. There is still another way of putting in its true light the falsity of Protestantism; it is to show that *its rule of Faith* is also absolutely inadmissible and contrary to the will of Jesus Christ. This *basis* once *overthrown*, the *whole edifice* of the innovators of the XVIth century falls to the ground.

The Bible, *nothing but the Bible freely interpreted by each individual,* this was at the beginning, this still is the rule of Faith of all true Protestants, that is to say, the principle which determines their belief.

"In order to know the religion of Protestants," says Chillingworth, "neither the doctrine of Luther, nor that of Calvin, or Melanchthon, is to be taken, nor the Confession of Augsburg or Geneva, nor the Catechism of Heidelberg, nor the Articles of the Anglican Church, nor even the harmony of all the Protestant confessions, but that which they all subscribe to as the perfect rule of their Faith and actions, that is to say, the Bible. Yes, the Bible, THE BIBLE ALONE, IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS."—See "The Religion of Protestants, a Sure Road to Salvation," by Dr. Chillingworth. (vi, 56.)

We Catholics also profess the greatest respect for the *Sacred Scriptures;* but these Scriptures we receive from the

hands of the Church, who *through her infallible authority* establishes the canon or authentic catalogue of the Sacred Books and guarantees *their divine inspiration*. Moreover, we receive from the same hand and with the same veneration, Tradition, that is to say, the Word of God not contained in the Sacred Books. Finally, far from claiming, as Protestants do, that everyone has the right to determine for himself the meaning of Scripture, far from proclaiming each man the judge and arbiter of his belief, we say, on the contrary, that it is to the Church, assisted by the Holy Ghost, that belongs the right to *determine the meaning* of the Sacred Text as well as to interpret *Tradition* in an infallible manner. In a word, our rule of Faith is the doctrinal authority of the Church, her living and infallible teaching. Therefore the Catholic principle differs *radically* and *substantially* from the rule of Faith devised by the Protestant Reformers. In place of the Bible and the Bible interpreted by private judgment, the Catholic rule is this: The written and unwritten Word of God taught and interpreted by the Pastors of the Church in harmony and communion with the Apostolic See.

THESIS.—The rule of Faith of Protestants cannot be admitted

63. First Argument. This rule of Faith is *contrary to the will and provision of Jesus Christ, and condemned by the Sacred Scriptures themselves.*

(1) In order to remain faithful to their rule of Faith, Protestants should prove to us, by formal texts of the Bible itself, that the Apostles *received from the Divine Master the order to put into writing* the teachings falling from His lips. Far from being able to do this, they read, as we do in the Bible, that after having founded His Church on Peter and the twelve Apostles, He did not say to them: "Go and distribute Bibles," but He said: "*Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you*

all days, even to the consummation of the world. . . . Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature.'' (Matt. 28, 19–20; Mark 16, 15.)

(2) Giving the example by His own acts, Jesus Christ *preached,* but He wrote nothing; nowhere do we find that He taught anything by writing and much less *exclusively* by writing. ''Christ,'' says St. John Chrysostom, ''did not leave a single writing to His Apostles; in place of books, He promised them the Holy Ghost. 'It is he,' Jesus says, 'that will inspire you with what you shall say.' (Matt. 10, 19-20; John 14, 25-26.)''

(3) The Apostles, to whom Jesus Christ promised that the Holy Ghost would recall to them everything that He had taught them, did what their Master commanded them to do. It was only later and incidentally that some of them have written anything. The other Apostles wrote nothing, and yet they converted entire nations. It is *by preaching* that they propagated the Faith throughout the world. It was only at the end of the first century, about sixty-seven years after the death of Christ that the composition of the New Testament was finished. The Faithful, therefore, according to the Protestant principle, had no rule of Faith for many long years!

''The inspired writings of the Apostles, and of the two disciples, Mark and Luke, which make up what afterwards became the New Testament, were composed between A.D. 54 and 98. The Church, therefore, had been guided by oral teaching, under the immediate influence of Christ and the Apostles for more than twenty years before a word of it was written: and what was written grew up in her bosom out of the fullness of doctrinal and practical knowledge she already possessed. It was nowhere said or assumed in these most ancient documents that men were to take the writings of the Apostles and their disciples for the sole rule of Faith and discipline, and to seek in them alone the knowledge of God's revelation. Neither was it anywhere said nor hinted that the Apostles had written down all that was essential for believers, or all they had taught by word of mouth. At the end of his earthly course St. Paul referred his disciple Timothy, not to

his Epistles or the writings of other Apostles, but to what he had heard him teach orally, that teaching he was to hand on to trustworthy men, to be faithfully preserved and imparted. (II Tim. 2, 2.) It was, then, this oral tradition which appeared to St. Paul the fittest means for securing Christian doctrine pure and genuine to after generations, when the first generation of disciples was passed away. Even when he did refer them to an earlier Epistle addressed to them, to whose contents they were to adhere, he did not forget to mention first what they had been taught by word, as the richer source of information. (II Thes. 2, 14.) All know that it is by means of tradition that we learn of the substitution of Sunday for Saturday, of the validity of Baptism conferred by heretics, and of the lawfulness of Baptism administered to infants. But, at the same time, we must maintain, in accordance with the frequently repeated testimony of the Fathers and other writers of the ancient Church, that there is hardly any point of Christian doctrine which is not attested and laid down in the Apostolic writings. The Church cannot and dare not receive any teaching which does not find its justification in the Bible, and it is not contained somewhere in the New Testament in a more or less developed form, or at least indicated or implied in premises of which it is the logical sequel, and is thus shown to fit into the harmonic and organic whole of Christian doctrine.'' (''The First Age of Christianity and the Church,'' by John J. I. Döllinger, 1860.)

64. (4) Moreover, the sacred writers constantly allude to oral teaching. Take as instances in point two remarkable conversions related by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, those of St. Paul and of the eunuch of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians. In both cases oral teaching is prescribed by the Lord Himself, as the means of imparting to them the divine gift of the knowledge of Christian Faith.

''*And he* (Saul) *trembling and astonished said: Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said to him: Arise and go into the city; and there it shall be told thee what thou must do.*'' (Acts 9, 6–7.)

''*And he* (the eunuch) *was returning sitting in his chariot,*

and reading Isaias the prophet. And the Spirit said to Philip: Go near and join thyself to that chariot. And Philip running thither, heard him reading the prophet Isaias, and he said: Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest? And he said: How can I unless some one show me? And he ordered Philip to come up and sit with him." (Acts 8, 28–31.) The inspired writers explicitly declare that they have put in writing only a very small part of the teachings of the Savior (John 20, 30–31; 21, 25); and they recommended the Faithful to have the same respect for what they, the Apostles, have taught by word of mouth as for that which they have taught in their writings. St. Paul writes to the Thessalonians: "*Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions, which you have learned by word or by our epistle.*" (II Thes. 2, 14.) And to Timothy: "*And the things which thou hast heard from me before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also.*" (II Tim. 2, 2.) Who does not know that it is by means of tradition that we know of the substitution of Sunday for Saturday, of the validity of Baptism conferred by heretics, and of the lawfulness of Baptism administered to infants? If there is in the Church a sure and invariable rule, followed by all the Fathers, proclaimed by all the Councils, observed by all the Doctors, it is most assuredly faithfully to follow the command so often repeated by St. Paul: "*Keep the deposit,*" that is, as St. Vincent of Lerins says, "keep not what you yourselves have discovered, but what was confided to you, what you have received through others, and not what you had to find yourselves; a thing which one does not find in his mind, but which one learns from those who preceded him; which it is not permitted to establish by private effort, but which you must have received from hand to hand, by public tradition, and of which you must not be the author, but the guardian." (Common.)

65. Second Argument. This rule of Faith is condemned by what we learn from the *history of the Church.* According to St. Irenæus (A.D. 202), there was already in his time "a multitude of uncivilized people, who believed in Jesus Christ,

without paper and without ink." These countries had no Sacred Scriptures, and yet the same Saint states, they preserved the Faith pure and intact by means of tradition.

Do we see anywhere in the history of later times that the ministers of the Church carried with them loads of books, and that these books were distributed before their preaching? Moreover, how would this have been possible, before the invention of printing, that is to say, during fourteen centuries, when copies of the Bible were scarce and very expensive? During all this long period the immense majority of the Faithful had nothing to instruct them but the oral and traditional teachings of the ministers of the Church. Were not these men Christians?

From what we have said it evidently follows that the Church was founded *without* the Bible and that she existed *before* the Bible. The Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse did not make the Christian communities or the Church, for those writings were addressed to communities already formed and fully organized. It is therefore with perfect reason that St. Augustine has said that he would not believe in the Gospel, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not decide him to do so: *Ego Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.*

66. Third Argument. In any event, if the Bible, freely interpreted by everybody, were the only rule of Faith, *the great mass of mankind* could not, even in our day, attain the Faith necessary for salvation, for there is a great number of them who cannot read, and others, absorbed in the labor of their hands, have not the time to do so. And yet, according to the Protestant theory, it is necessary that every man should assure himself, by his own study, of the inspiration of the Bible, of its authenticity and completeness, of the fidelity of the version placed in his hands and of the true sense of each verse. If God had given the Bible as the rule of Faith, if, as the Protestants would have it, He had made a law obligatory on all Christians to read the Bible themselves, He would thereby have made entrance into the Church and eternal salvation impossible to the immense majority of mankind, and

especially to the poor. Now, Jesus has made precisely the evangelization of the poor one of the marks of His divine mission. (Luke 4, 18; 7, 22.)

67. Fourth Argument. Without *the authority of the Church* it would be impossible to fix the *Canon* or authentic catalogue of the inspired books of Holy Scripture, and to propose to the belief of the Faithful a complete body of doctrine absolutely and permanently determined. The study of the books themselves, the testimony of history, the substantially identical readings of different manuscripts, in a word, criticism cannot determine the canon of the inspired books with sufficient certitude to render an act of divine faith possible. Have we not seen Protestants, under the pretext of modern Higher Criticism, reject one after another several books of the Old and of the New Testament, and even deny altogether the divine inspiration of the Scriptures?

Protestants reproach the Catholic Church for not allowing to all the Faithful indifferently the reading of the Bible. But it is precisely because the Waldenses, the Albigenses and especially Protestants, have made an abusive use of Sacred Texts, and that the latter have inundated the world with *falsified* Bibles, that the Church, to preserve her flock, has felt herself obliged to put wise restrictions upon the reading of the Sacred Scriptures. These restrictions, let us carefully remember, apply only to the Bible *translated into the vulgar tongues.*

The recent Apostolic Constitution of Leo XIII, dated February, 1897, forbids the reading without authorization, of "all versions in native languages, even those published by Catholics, if they have not been approved by the Apostolic See, or edited under the supervision of the Bishops, with notes taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers."

68. To complete our demonstration of Chapter III, in which we prove that Protestantism does not possess the notes or marks of the true Church of Christ, we add the following documents, which our readers will peruse with profit. They are quoted by His Grace Bede Vaughan, late Archbishop of Sydney, Australia, in his "Advent Conferences":

"Father Jones' Epitome of Milner's views regarding the principle of private judgment and the Bible only, may not be altogether useless to those who wish for a concise and clear exposition of this strange religious fallacy.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND'S FALLACIOUS RULE OF FAITH

"The *Rule of Faith,* adopted by the Church of England, and by other classes of Protestants, is the *written Word of God,* or the *Bible alone, according as it is understood by each particular person.* That this is not the *True Rule of Faith,* I shall prove, chiefly, by means of two of the maxims already laid down, namely: *The Rule of Faith appointed by Christ must be* CERTAIN *and* UNERRING; *that is to say, it must be one which is not liable to lead any rational and sincere inquirer into inconsistency or error.* Secondly, *this Rule must be* UNIVERSAL; *that is to say, it must be proportioned to the abilities and circumstances of the great bulk of mankind.*

"I begin by observing that if Christ had intended that all mankind should learn His religion from a *Book,* namely, the *New Testament,* He Himself would have written that Book, and would have enjoined the obligation of learning to read it: whereas, it does not appear that He ever wrote anything at all, unless perhaps the sins of the Pharisees with his finger upon the dust. (John 8, 6.) It does not even appear that He gave His Apostles any command to *write* the Gospel; though He emphatically commanded them to *preach* it (Matt. 10), and that to all the nations of the earth. (Matt. 28.) In this ministry they all spent their lives *preaching* the Religion of Christ in every country, from Judea to Spain in one direction, and to India in another; everywhere establishing Churches, and *commending their doctrine to faithful men who should be fit to teach others also.* (II Tim. ii, 2.) Only *a part* of them *wrote* anything; and what these did write, was, for the most part, addressed to particular persons or congregations, and on particular occasions. The Evangelists were moved by the Holy Ghost to write their respective Gospels; nevertheless there is nothing in the Gospels which indicates that any one of them, or all of them together, contain an *entire, detailed, and clear* exposition of the Religion of Jesus Christ. The Canon-

ical Epistles show the particular occasions on which they were written, and thus prove, as a Protestant Bishop observes, that, 'they are not to be considered as regular treatises on the Christian Religion.'

"Again, in supposing our Saviour to have appointed His bare *written* word for the *Rule of our Faith,* without any authorized judge to decide on the unavoidable controversies growing out of it, we must suppose Him to have acted differently from what common sense has dictated to all other legislators. For, where do we read of a legislator, who, after dictating a code of laws, neglected to appoint judges and magistrates, to decide their meaning, and to enforce obedience to the decision? 'It were better,' says the illustrious Fénelon, alluding to the Protestant *Rule,* 'to live without any law, than to have laws which all men might interpret according to their several opinions and interests.'

"In fact, the method of determining religious questions by *Scripture only, according to each individual's interpretation,* must naturally produce, and always has produced, whenever and wherever it has been adopted, endless and incurable religious differences, and of course *errors;* because truth is *one.* It is liable to produce such differences, because the Scripture is open to all interpretations, however varying or contradictory. It cannot, of itself, decide controversies of religion, since it remains a dead letter under every interpretation. It remains always true in itself; but it is silent as to the truth or falsehood of any interpretation. That it has produced such differences, the records of history and our own observation bear witness. 'See,' says St. Augustine, 'into how many morsels those are divided, who have divided themselves from the unity of the Church.' 'It is natural,' says Tertullian, 'for error to be ever changing. The disciples have the same right in this matter as their masters had.'

"69. To speak now only of the Protestant Reformers, no sooner had their leader, Martin Luther, set up the tribunal of private judgment on the sense of Scripture, in opposition to the authority of the Church ancient and modern, than his disciples, proceeding on his own principle, undertook to prove

from the same Scripture that his own doctrine was erroneous, and that the Reformation itself wanted reforming. Carlstadt, Zwinglius, Œcolompadius, Muncer, and a hundred more of his followers, wrote and preached against him, and against each other, with the utmost virulence; still each of them equally claiming the sanction of the Scripture—thus making the Word of eternal Truth contradict itself in the contradictory doctrines which they deduced from it; while they acknowledged no authority that could compose their differences, or rectify their errors. In vain did Luther claim a superiority over them; in vain did he denounce hell against them; in vain did he threaten to return to the Catholic Church. He had put the Bible into each man's hand, to explain it for himself; and this his followers continued to do in open defiance of him, till their mutual contradictions and discords became so numerous and scandalous, as to overwhelm the thinking part of them with grief and confusion. 'Our people,' writes one of them, 'are carried away with every wind of doctrine. There is not one point which is not held by some of them as an article of faith, and by others as an impiety.' The same language may, with equal truth, be applied to every period of the Reformation; it may, with peculiar propriety, be applied to our days, and to our country, divided as it is by countless and ever-varying sects, while all, contradicting each other, confidently appeal to the same Sacred Scripture. I would here ask, how can Protestants seriously believe, that *Scripture privately interpreted* can be a secure *Rule,* unless each one, even the most ignorant, can be certain that he understands the Scripture in its *right sense?* And how can each Protestant be certain that he understands it in its *right sense,* while around him he finds so many others who claim an equal right of judging with himself, understanding it in various and contradictory senses, all differing from his own? 'The Gospel,' as St. Jerome observes, 'consists not in the words, but in the sense. A wrong explanation turns the Word of God into the word of man.'

"Nor has the unbounded license of explaining Scripture, each one in his own way, which Protestants claim, been confined in its effects to mere errors and dissensions. It has

caused also mutual persecutions and bloodshed; it has produced tumults, rebellions and anarchy beyond recounting. Luther formed a league of Princes and States in Germany against the Emperor, which desolated the Empire for more than a century. His disciples, Muncer and Stork, taking advantage of the pretended *evangelical liberty* which he taught, claimed, at the head of forty thousand Anabaptists, the empire and possession of the world; and this because they were, so they said, the *meek ones who were to possess the land* (Matt. 5, 4), and sought to enforce their demands with fire and sword. Zwinglius lighted up a similar flame throughout Switzerland. Dr. Hay asserts that 'the misinterpretation of Scripture brought on the miseries of the Civil War'; and Lord Clarendon, and other writers, show that there was not a crime committed by the Puritan rebels, in the course of it, which they did not profess to justify by texts and instances drawn from the sacred volumes.

"We see then, to what endless dissensions, errors, and even crimes, the principle of *Private Interpretation of Scripture*, no less than that of supposed *Private Inspiration*, has conducted men, and of course is ever liable to conduct them. This therefore proves, according to the self-evident maxim stated above, that *Scripture privately interpreted* cannot be the *Rule* which is to bring us to religious truth. Dr. Whitaker, though a Protestant, acknowledges that 'the private interpretation of Scripture *must* be uncertain, and therefore *may* be false.' Now it would be no less than blasphemy to say that Christ established, as a *Rule* of religious faith, that which was liable to lead astray those who should follow it.

"70. Again, according to another evident maxim before laid down, this cannot be the *right Rule*, because it cannot be *universal* in its application. Even if it were in itself (which we have seen it is not) a sufficient and safe *Rule*, still it is obviously not adapted to the great bulk of mankind, in all their various circumstances. How *very large* a proportion of mankind, of the different ages and countries since the time of Christ, have not been able to read? Of those who have been

able to read, how few, comparatively, have been able to obtain copies of the Bible, more especially before the invention of printing? And of those who have been able to obtain and read the Bible, how few could have leisure and capability to examine, and compare, the various parts of this sacred, sublime, and mysterious Volume, to reconcile apparent contradictions, to ascertain what was intended for example and what only as narrative, what was to be understood literally and what figuratively? It must follow then that the *Rule of Scripture alone* could not have been the *Rule* established by Christ, since by establishing such a *Rule* He would have excluded vast multitudes of mankind, throughout the world, from the means of arriving at the knowledge of His truths.

"Thus (to repeat in a few words the substance of this discussion), we find, when we take a view of the general circumstances of mankind, that few, comparatively, could make use of the *Rule* in question; and, on the other hand, we have seen that those who could make and have made use of it, have been led by it into pernicious and endless contradictions, dissensions, errors, and impieties.

"After considering all this, let those who adhere to this *Rule* here ask themselves candidly and seriously, whether they can still reasonably believe that a *Rule,* thus limited and uncertain, can be the *Rule* which Christ established to direct the faith and conduct of his followers? Let them seriously reflect that there are in Scripture, as the Scripture itself affirms, *things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest to their own destruction.* (II Pet. 3, 16.) . . . Let them listen to the words and follow the counsel of St. Augustine: 'If you think you have been sufficiently tossed about, and wish to see an end to your anxieties, follow the Rule of Catholic Discipline, which has come down to us through the Apostles from Christ Himself, and which shall descend from us to the latest posterity. (De utilit. credendi, c. 8.)"

71. The following is a declaration made by the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors, in Great

Britain, November, 1838, with regard to the old charge of the Church being an *enemy to the reading and circulating* of the Holy Scriptures.

ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

"In England the Catholic Church is held out *as an enemy to the reading and circulating of the Holy Scriptures.*

"Whereas the Catholic Church venerates the Holy Scriptures as the written part of the Word of God; she has in all ages been the faithful guardian of this Sacred deposit; she has ever labored to preserve the integrity of these inspired writings, and the true sense in which they have been universally understood at all times from the Apostolic age.

"The Catholic Church has never forbidden or discouraged the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the Sacred Scriptures, in the original languages. She binds her clergy to the daily recital of a Canonical office which comprises a large portion of the Sacred Volume, and to read and expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, on Sundays, the Epistle or Gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law.

"As to translations of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective Pastors. . . .

"The Catholics in England, of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes, and are exhorted to read them in the spirit of piety, humility and obedience.

"Pope Pius VII, in a Rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the Vicars Apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care, in faith and good works; and for that end, to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating than the reading of the Sacred Scriptures, understood in their true sense—they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian.

"But when, according to the Protestant system, the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures, so read and circulated, are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual; then such reading, circulation and interpretation are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of His law to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written—that it was not by means of the Scriptures that the Apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion and to seditions and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms.

"72. But we are assured that Luther and Tyndal and others first made the Bible known. Is not this another

calumny of our accusers, another perversion of the plainest history? Let us break it to pieces.

"Was there absolutely no Bible in the world, or nothing done in the way of publishing between the date of the invention of printing and Luther's production of his translation? On the contrary, we know from historical records that before the first Protestant version saw the light, the Catholic Church had already sent out eighty-four editions of the Scriptures, sixty-two in Hebrew and twenty-two in Greek. That in the Latin tongue—the common language of the learned—she had sent out three hundred and forty-three editions, of which one hundred and forty-eight were of the entire Bible, sixty-two of the New Testament and one hundred and thirty-three of separate books. But they were for the learned? Perhaps the people were forbidden to read the book? This also is as stupid a calumny as all the rest. One hundred and ninety-eight editions of the Scriptures were published for the people in the common tongue before Luther's book had been dreamt of. There were one hundred and four editions of the whole Bible. Of these twenty were in Italian, twenty-six in French, nineteen in Flemish, two Spanish, six Bohemian, one Slavonic, and thirty in German. In all, including the Polyglot, six hundred and twenty-six editions of the Bible and portions of the Bible, of which one hundred and ninety-eight were in the language of the laity, had issued from the press with the sanction and at the instance of the Church, in the countries where she reigned supreme, before the first Protestant version of the Scriptures was sent forth into the world. As to England in particular, I conclude these observations with an apposite quotation from an Anglican authority: 'There has been much wild and foolish writing,' says Blunt, 'about the scarcity of the Bible in the ages preceding the Reformation. It has been taken for granted that the Holy Scripture was almost a sealed book to clergy and laity until it was printed in English by Tyndal and Coverdale, and that the only real source of knowledge respecting it before then was the translation made by Wickliffe. The facts are that the clergy and monks were daily reading large portions of the Bible, and had them stored

up in their memory by constant recitation; that they made very free use of Holy Scripture in preaching, so that even a modern Bible reader is astonished at the number of quotations and references contained in medieval sermons; that countless copies of the Bible were written out by the surprising industry of cloistered scribes; that many glosses or commentaries were written, which are still to be seen, full of pious and wise thoughts; and that all laymen who could read, were, as a rule, provided with their Gospels, their Psalter, or other devotional portions of the Bible. Men did, in fact, take a vast amount of personal trouble with regard to the productions of the Holy Scriptures; and accomplished by head, hand and heart, what is now chiefly done by paid workmen and machinery. The clergy studied the word of God, and made it known to the laity; and those few among the laity, who could read, had abundant opportunity of reading the Bible, either in Latin or in English, up to the Reformation period. . . . Notwithstanding the immense destruction of manuscripts by the English Puritans, there still exist many vernacular Gospels, Psalters, and complete Bibles, of dates ranging from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries, relics that were witness to extensive labors, of which devouring time and fanatic ignorance have spared but a representative portion. The earliest of these translations known to us now is one of the Psalters by Adhelm, Bishop of Sherborne (A.D. 656–709). The Venerable Bede (672–735) made a translation, the extent of which is not recorded; but on the evening of his death he was engaged in finishing the Gospel of St. John by the aid of an amanuensis. King Alfred (A.D. 849–901) is said to have translated the whole Bible; and it is certain that he executed some portions of such a translation. In the British Museum there is a magnificent English copy of the Gospels, called the 'Durham Book,' which is not more recent than the time of King Alfred; and there is another of the same age in the Bodleian Library at Oxford; a Psalter of the same period is in the Chapter Library at Salisbury (in Latin and Anglo-Saxon), and a book of the Gospels of rather a later date, in Corpus Christi Library, Cambridge; and doubtless many more known to those

familiar with our manuscript treasures. (J. H. Blunt, "On the Reformation of the Church of England," vol. I, p. 505.)

"Thus the Church of God, after having formed the Canon of Sacred Scripture, preserved it from the contamination and adulteration of spurious texts, defended it age after age against those who would tear it limb from limb, and mince it and parcel it, and pervert its genuine meaning; thus has she during her long career been consistent in her dealing with it, treating it as the food of her children, and as the meat on which heroes and athletes are fed. Thus has she lavished the precious things of earth upon it, the pearl from the sea, the gem from the rock, and the gold and silver from the mine, to make it beautiful; whilst her children thought no privilege greater than that of being allowed to spend their lives in studying, transcribing and embellishing its Sacred Pages." (See also Maitland, "The Dark Ages," Scriptural Knowledge, pp. 503–509, John Hodges, London, 1890.)

Conclusion of Chapter III

73. From all that has been said it clearly follows that the work of the innovators or reformers of the XVIth century is not the work of Jesus Christ. In Chapter V we shall further see that in the Primacy granted by Jesus Christ to St. Peter and to his successors there is an unanswerable and easily understood proof of the illegitimacy of Protestantism.

Let us pray to God that our wandering brethren may, in the end, remember that *their ancestors were Catholic*, and that they may be convinced that in becoming Catholics themselves, they will not be changing religion. They will only be returning to the religion, which their fathers so unfortunately abandoned three centuries ago.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIENTAL SCHISMATIC CHURCH DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH

74. Remarks. 1. We are not now concerned with the Nestorian, Jacobite or Eutychian heresies, which drag a lingering existence in the East and which existed long before the Eastern schism. It is evident that the true Church of Jesus Christ cannot be found in these religious remnants, whose origin and authors can inspire no confidence; which have been formally condemned in the Ecumenical Councils of Ephesus (A.D. 431) and of Chalcedon (A.D. 451); which sects, far from having any unity between each other, are actually at war with each other; and which are, moreover, limited to some countries and have no force of expansion.

2. Care must be taken not to confound the Schismatic Greek Church with the *United* Greek Church. The latter, though having a particular liturgy and certain special disciplinary customs, forms a part of the Catholic Church. It embraces the Maronite Church, the Chaldean Church, and the Uniat or Melchite Greeks, all in communion with the Roman Pontiff. In all ages the Church has authorized usages peculiar to certain people in the celebration of Mass and the administration of the Sacraments, when these usages are not contrary to the dogmas of Faith. Thus in the memorable act in which it proclaimed the solemn reunion of the two Churches, the General Council of Florence (A.D. 1438) decreed "the immutable preservation of the customs of both Churches." Much more, acting in this according to the example of his predecessors, the Pope Benedict XIV (1743), severely prohibited the members from passing from one rite to another, and showed, in his Encyclical, that Rome has always endeavored to preserve intact the Oriental rite and always commanded its adherents to remain faithful to the liturgy of their Church.

This was also the line of conduct followed by Pius IX, and this was also, as everyone knows, the principle adopted by

Leo XIII. We see thereby how vain is the fear on this subject that some ill-informed or ill-disposed writers seek to spread among schismatics, always extremely jealous of preserving their ancient usages.

75. Historical Notice. Under the generic name of the Greek Schismatic Church are understood the religious bodies emanating from the great Schism of the East, begun in the IXth century by Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, but really consummated in the XIth century, by the ambition of Michael Cerularius, one of his successors, 1054.

Before Constantine had chosen Byzantium as his new capital, the episcopal see of that city depended upon the Metropolitan of Heraclea. But no sooner had that city received from the great emperor the title of "The second Rome, eldest and beloved daughter of the old Rome," than ambition arose in the hearts of its Bishops, proud of the favor which they enjoyed at Court and twisting to their advantage the third Canon of the first Council of Constantinople (381), which conferred upon the Bishop of Byzantium "the primacy *of honor* second to that of the Bishop of Rome," they did not wait long until they claimed to possess over the Eastern Church also the primacy of jurisdiction which had always belonged to the Roman Pontiffs. Claiming that Constantinople should be as exalted in ecclesiastical as it was in political matters, John the Faster (583) was the first to assume the title of Ecumenical or Universal Patriarch, and he maintained it in spite of the energetic protests and the prayers of Pelagius II and St. Gregory the Great.

Already in the Vth Century, the Pope, St. Leo, who had occasion to protest against the usurpation of the rights of the Church of Rome, had said with much truth: "the presence of the Emperor may make a royal residence, but he cannot create an *Apostolic See,* divine things not being patterned after human concerns."

The principle held and proclaimed by St. Leo is so evident that the clergy of Constantinople itself still follows, even in our day, Catholic tradition on this point. In fact it is well known that the Metropolitans of Chalcedon, Ephesus,

Nicomedia, Heraclea and Cyzicus are members of the Supreme Council of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and that they enjoy on that account, many and important privileges. The reason is that those cities, now reduced to the condition of unimportant villages or hamlets, were in the past celebrated cities or chief centers of great provinces. If it were true that the vicissitudes of human politics bring about corresponding changes in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, these Metropolitans should, long ago, have yielded their privileges to the Bishops of Candia, Smyrna, Thessalonica, Rhodes, and many other cities. Moreover, if the Schismatic Greeks were consistent, if the motives put forth by John the Faster were founded on reason, the Bishop of Constantinople should have renounced the title of Universal Patriarch, because for centuries the Byzantine Empire has ceased to exist. Besides, this pompous title is all the more ridiculous in our day, from the fact that this Patriarch has not now under his jurisdiction even one-sixth of the Christians of the Oriental Schismatic rite!

It is evident that, if change had to be made in the hierarchal order of the Church every time that a political change were to occur in a country, we should be logically forced to say that Jesus Christ had founded His Church on shifting sand (Matt. 7, 24–25), and not, as He proclaimed, upon a rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. In such a condition of things, it would require only a handful of soldiers or the caprice of a sovereign to sap the foundation and cause the ruin of the divine edifice.

Despite the ever-increasing ambition of the Bishops of Constantinople, the confirmation of every new Patriarch by the Pope continued, before and after Photius, to be considered, if not indispensable, at least of great importance for the newly-elected Bishop, to increase his prestige and as a proof of his orthodoxy. Thus Photius himself, though he had usurped the See of Constantinople, did not fail to send to Rome an embassy to request his confirmation from Pope Nicholas I. The letter of the Bishop-elect to the Sovereign Pontiff contained a profession of orthodox Faith that gained for him the praise of the head of the Church. The confirmation was, how-

ever, refused, and in a Roman Council the usurper was excommunicated. It was only after reconciliation, followed by a second excommunication, fulminated by Pope John VIII, that Photius threw away the mask and cast off what he called the yoke of Rome. Then, to give to his rebellion a semblance of reason, he pretended that the Popes had become heretical, because, he asserted, they had tolerated the words *Filioque* in the Niceo-Constantinopolitan Creed. The protest was made over four hundred years after the addition of these words! And again, it was only much later, after the final separation, that the discussion as to the *expediency* of the addition of the words *Filioque* degenerated into a dogmatic question concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost itself, the clergy of Constantinople claiming that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone.

It would be easy to prove that this procession of the Holy Ghost, as professed by the Catholic Church, had always been the subject of universal belief; it was, moreover, authentically acknowledged by the Greeks at the Ecumenical Council of Florence. If, in a Council held at Toledo, in 448, the words *Filioque* (and from the Son, viz., proceeding from the Son as well as from the Father) were added to the Formula of Nice, it was in order to put an end to the heresy of the Sabellians, who were denying that the Holy Ghost was personally distinct from the Father and the Son.

After Photius, the two Churches continued to be united, up to the time of Michael Cerularius, who renewed the claims previously put forth by Photius against the Roman Church, and who consummated the separation from the Church universal. Later a reconciliation was brought about and solemnly proclaimed at the Council of Florence, held in 1438 under the Pontificate of Eugenius IV; but the ill-will of the clergy of Constantinople almost completely annulled the effect of this reunion.

Let us observe that the right and duty of this reunion of the two Churches, thus decreed and proclaimed by an Ecumenical Council, recognized as legitimate by the Greek Church there largely represented, still rightfully exists unto our day.

No later Council having abrogated or modified this solemn act, spontaneously signed by all, it still preserves its legal canonical force; consequently, in the eyes of every enlightened and sincere Greek, the Sovereign Pontiff, successor of Peter, ought to be acknowledged as the lawful and Supreme Head of the Eastern as well as of the Western Church.

It is well that we should have correct ideas on the present situation of the separated Eastern Church. The following brief items will enable us to accomplish this purpose:

The Oriental Schismatic Church may be thus divided: First, into the Church of the Russian Empire; secondly, into that within the Turkish Empire, with Constantinople as capital; thirdly, into the Church of the Kingdom of Greece. The Church of the Russian Empire, at one time under the immediate control of the Archbishop of Moscow, and subsequently ruled by a Patriarch, is now at the sole mercy of the so-called "*Holy* Synod of St. Petersburg," (now extinct) and though it would scorn to avow it, is, to all intents and purposes, a tool in the hands of the Czar, for without his sanction no change in the existing order of things can be made; not even can a Council be convoked without first humbly asking his permission.

The Church within the Turkish Empire is made up of the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Constantinople, the headquarters of the Ottoman Empire, is also the chief patriarchal seat, and still rejoices in the proud title of New Rome. The Sultan is virtually the head of this Church, and though they would fain deny it, its Bishops and Patriarchs are forced to confess that he is the supreme and final arbiter in every important dispute.

They thus met with a condign punishment for their rebellion against Rome. Instead of being the docile children of the Father of Christendom, they became the abject slaves of the successors of the impure Mahomet. Refusing to be ruled by the Tiara, they must submit to the Crescent.

The Church of the Kingdom of Greece, though nominally governed by the Synod of Athens, is as much a creature of the state as that of Constantinople or Russia, for it depends

for its entire movement and being upon the will of the reigning monarch. It acknowledges no submission whatever to Constantinople, nor to any other branch of the Eastern Church.

Although these three great divisions of the Oriental Church include within their jurisdiction several Churches which are both heretical and schismatical at the same time, still, as far as validity of Orders is concerned, the Holy See has expressed her doubt of none save of the Abyssinian.

76. The Greek schism has spread into Turkey, Greece, in a portion of Austria, and into Russia. The importance of the Russian nation requires that we should particularly explain how the Schism was introduced into that country.

It would be a grave error to believe that Russia was won over to schism at the time of her conversion to Christianity. When, at the end of the Xth century, this immense country received in a sure and definite manner the benefit of the *Catholic* Faith, the Churches of the East and the West *were living together in unity of Faith and government.* Russia owed her conversion principally to the Princess Olga, regent of the kingdom from A.D. 945 to 955; but the movement towards Christianity became definite and complete only under the reign of her grandson, Vladimir the Great or the Apostolic. This zealous prince caused to be brought into the country *Greek priests* to teach the Russian people the principles of the Christian religion. We can thence understand the great influence that, from the beginning, the Byzantine clergy enjoyed with the newly-christianized nation, an influence which later on introduced the evil of schism into the midst of this powerful nation.

In reality the religion of the Russia of to-day is no more Greek than it is Prussian or Anglican. Though, at the time it embraced the Schism, it had a Metropolitan immediately dependent upon the Patriarch of Constantinople, it has long ago broken this bond, which attached it to the center of the great Schism of the East.

In 1589, the Metropolitan of Moscow was raised to the dignity of Patriarch; but Peter the Great suppressed the

Patriarchate, and from that time the Russian Church has been governed by the so-called *Holy Synod,* which exercises its functions in the name and by the authority of the Russian Czar, and is presided over by an officer of his Court. Thus that country's religion, separated not only from Rome and Constantinople, but from every patriarchate, intimately bound up with the autocratic government which rules all the Russias, is simply the *national* religion of Russia, and should be called Moscovitism. There is nothing strange in the fact that in later times the Russian Church should have given to itself the name of *Orthodox* Church. Is there a schismatic or heretical sect that has not claimed to profess *the true doctrine?* We are, on the other hand, indeed pleased to acknowledge that the whole of the Greek Church, far different in this from the Protestant sects, has always preserved and still preserves unaltered almost all the dogmas of Faith, as it received them at the time of the separation, which are in great part identical with those of Rome. This is most clearly shown by the very institutions of this Church, the writings of the Fathers most venerated by it, the prayers and hymns sung every day in the offices and ceremonies of worship, the religious practices and the traditions of the people.

Protestants take great pleasure in calling attention, with quite an air of triumph, to the obstinacy with which the Greeks persevere in schism and hatred against the Church of Rome. But do they not see that these very Schismatics are witnesses against them? In fact nearly all the dogmas in which we believe are almost exactly the same as those openly professed by the Greek Church. Evidently it is not since their schism that these obstinate enemies of the Roman Church have borrowed from her the dogmas which they now believe. Hence it must be admitted that such has always been the belief of the whole Church. Then what becomes of the reproach made by Protestants that the Catholic Church has in the course of centuries introduced new doctrines? And then why did Protestants not join the Eastern Church at the time of their rebellion against Rome?

§ I. The Greek Church Possesses Neither Unity of Belief nor Unity of Ministry

77. "According to the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas (2a 2æ, q. xxxix, a. 1) the name of Schismatics is given to those who refuse obedience and allegiance to the visible Head of the Church, the Supreme Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ and the successor of St. Peter. He also explains the difference between heresy and schism. Heresy is opposed to faith, schism to union and charity; so that although all heretics are schismatics, because loss of faith involves separation from the Church, yet all schismatics are not heretics, since a man may, from anger, pride, ambition, or the like, sever himself from the communion of the Church, and yet believe all that which the Church proposes for our belief. Still a state of pure schism—that is, of schism without heresy, cannot continue long—at least in the case of a large number of men. The words of St. Jerome (on Titus, chap. 3d) quoted by St. Thomas are to the point: 'Schism at the beginning may be understood as something different from heresy; but there is no schism which does not invent some heresy for itself, in order to justify its secession.' History abundantly confirms this observation. Bodies, which at first separate from the Church, merely because they think their personal rights have been infringed, are sure, in the end, to deny the Church's unity and to lose the spirit of faith. And so, St. Thomas remarks that, as loss of charity is the way to loss of faith, so schism is the road to heresy." (Catholic Dictionary.) Such has been the case both with the Oriental and with the Anglican schisms. Separation from Rome was soon followed by separation from the Faith of Christ.

A. That unity of belief be *possible* there is required an authority, a tribunal capable of pronouncing an infallible decision on matters of Faith. Now, the Greek Church does not possess such a tribunal. Would any one say that the Patriarch of Constantinople has this authority? In the first place, from what source would the Patriarch derive his authority? Jesus Christ has given only one Head to His Church, and this Head,

as we shall show (in the next chapter), was St. Peter, and after him the Bishops of Rome. What then could have deprived the successors of St. Peter of their divine authority, acknowledged by all during eight centuries, and have transferred it to the Patriarch of Constantinople? Surely it was not the choice that Constantine made of Byzantium as the capital of his new empire. The authority which the Roman Church received directly from Jesus Christ belongs to her so exclusively that it can neither be modified nor changed by any Council.

Moreover, the third decree of the first Council of Constantinople (381), which raised the Patriarch of that city above the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, gives to him, after all, only the *second* rank; he is placed after the Bishop of Rome. Now the Greek Church admits the authority of the first seven Ecumenical Councils. They are the following: First of Nice (A.D. 325), the first of Constantinople (A.D. 381), the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), the second of Constantinople (A.D. 553), the third of Constantinople (A.D. 680), and the second of Nice (A.D. 787).

The Greek Schismatics admit *in principle* that, when there arises a doubt relating to faith, the Patriarchs assembled in council have the right to pronounce doctrinal decisions; but as a matter of fact, no such assembly has ever been held since the time of Michael Cerularius, 895 years ago. In case of a doubt relating to dogma, the first seven general Councils are consulted. But who would venture to assert that *all the points* concerning dogmas and morals have been determined by these Councils of the first eight centuries, and that there can be found in them the solution of all the controversies that may arise until the end of time? Moreover, there is an evident contradiction in the Greek contention. If general Councils had the power necessary to decide finally all controversies in matters of Faith, by what right do they reject the authority of the Ecumenical Councils which have been held subsequently to the *first seven Councils?* And finally, if it be true that the first seven Councils supply the answer to all controverted ques-

tions, let them cite the Ecumenical Council which has decided that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone!

78. **B.** As to unity of government, it is far from existing in the Greek Church. The dependence of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch on the Church of Constantinople is only nominal; that of the Russian Church absolutely null. On the one hand, subjection of the Patriarchs and Bishops to the head of the Turkish Empire; on the other complete subordination and cringing servitude of the Russian Synod to the Czar—this is the deplorable state of the Eastern Church. Who can see in it the Church, one in Faith and free in action, which Jesus Christ founded on Peter, the one flock subject to the one and same shepherd? Is it to each of those two sovereigns that Jesus Christ has said: "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs"? In a word, the only bond which unites the various factions that compose the Schismatic Greek Church, and which permits the giving to them of a general name, is the common refusal of obedience to the successors of St. Peter in the See of Rome; it is their persistence in revolt against the religious authority established by Jesus Christ, acknowledged by the Greeks themselves until the IXth century, or more exactly, until the middle of the XIth century, and again admitted at the Council of Florence (A.D. 1438, 1439).

79. An Anglican minister, reported in the Paris *Univers* of February, 1852, speaking of the Oriental Schismatic Church, makes this statement regarding its belief: "The dogmatical errors professed in common by the Schismatics, whether Phothians or Russian Orthodox, as they style themselves, are the following:

"1. They deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son, as from one indivisible principle, and they only admit His procession from the Father. Hence their rejection of the clause *Filioque*—and from the Son—a dogma of the Catholic Church.

"2. They reject the dogma regarding the primacy of jurisdiction of St. Peter and his successors.

"3. The so-called Orthodox or Russian Schismatic Church denies the existence of Purgatory. This evidently appears

from the following document. The Schismatic Russian Bishop Macarius, rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg, in a recent work (1860) entitled 'The Dogmatic Orthodox Theology,' vol. 2, p. 729, speaks thus: 'According to the belief of the Orthodox (Russian) Church there is not after death a place, or class of souls, intermediary between those that are saved and go to heaven, and those that are damned and go to hell.' Whether this was only his own individual opinion we are not prepared to state. Excepting these errors (n. 79), which are, however, sufficient to destroy unity of Faith, in all the other articles of Christian belief they perfectly agree with Catholics, and admit with us the same Creed.'' Here we have an additional argument in favor of the doctrines held by the Catholic Church, as well as an additional weapon against all the sects that attack them.

§ II. The Schismatic Greek Church Does Not Possess the Mark of Sanctity

80. Who would dare claim that the authors of the Greek schism have been distinguished by their holy life, and that their revolt against the See of Peter had virtue for its only motive, and not rather ambition or passion as its moving power? Most assuredly we freely admit that among the millions of Schismatics who have been born and brought up in complete good faith in the bosom of the Greek Church, who, like us Catholics, have the grace of the Sacraments, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, there are many souls pleasing to the Lord and worthy of His favor. But we ask, where are the Saints produced by this Church since its separation from Rome, men of constant and heroic virtue, worthy of being compared with the Saints of the Roman Church? By what striking miracles, duly proven and completely authenticated according to historical criticism, has God manifested the heroic virtue of those personages, who, in Russia, are offered to the veneration of the popular masses? None whatever, as history proves. We abstain from speaking here of the moral debasement and the vices which are charged

against a considerable portion of the Russian clergy. If this be the effect of human frailty in ministers of the altar, we would have the right at least to expect on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities serious and persistent efforts to raise them out of this state of degradation and ignorance, and to make them less unworthy of the people's respect.

§ III. The Schismatic Church Does Not Possess the Mark of Catholicity

81. Since it has ceased through its revolt to form part of the Roman Catholic Church, the Schismatic Church is confined to the limits of a few countries in the East and to Russia. As to the *Russian* Church in particular, its very name clearly proves to us that it does not belong to Jesus Christ, for the Savior did not found *National* Churches; He wished, on the contrary, that there should be only one fold, under the staff of the one and sole shepherd. If the Russians claim that their Church forms part of the Greek Church, it is against all evidence, as no hierarchical bond unites the two Churches, the Russian and the Greek. We are not ignorant of the fact that at the *present time* there are *epistolary* relations between the Synod of St. Petersburg and the Schismatic Greek Patriarchs; but no one can see in what way these recent relations modify essentially the present situation, and in what respect especially they can change the situation during past centuries.

The Schismatic Church, notwithstanding the vast extent of the empire which protects it, does not possess Catholicity of numbers. According to recent statistics, the Schismatic Slavs number something over eighty millions. But, as we have shown, religious unity is far from reigning among these populations, which are united principally by the spirit of nationality, pushed to its extreme limits. In spite of the iron hand of despotism, which endeavors to prevent new schisms from introducing themselves into the old, we see swarming within it sects of every kind, known under the name of Raskolniki, the principal one of which is that of the Starovéres or Old Believers. It is by the millions that we can count the

dissenters who have severed all union with the Holy Synod, as the latter had done with the Patriarch of Constantinople, and he in turn with Rome. What would be its lot, if the temporal power, which sustains more or less efficiently this religious body, should happen to abandon it to its own destiny?

Let us add that the spirit of *Proselytism* born of the command of the divine Master: "Go and teach all nations," does not exist in the Greek Church. Russia is yet at the first page of its martyrdom, but on the other hand it can count by thousands the unfortunate Catholics of Poland, whom it endeavors to rob of their Faith by brutal violence and persistent persecution.

But it is gratifying to record that Russia has recently written a new page of martyrdom, for one of her zealous and devoted shepherds, Monsignor Budkiewicz, a Catholic prelate, has become worthy of the martyr's eulogy pronounced by Jesus Christ in His Gospel when He said: "*Greater love than this no man hath that a man lay down his life for his friends.*" (John 15, 13.) Every Catholic undertaking in Petrograd, during these recent years, was originally planned and successfully carried out by him at the very time when no apostolic work could be done in Russia without risk of terrible penalties inflicted by the Communistic Government that tyrannized over that unhappy country. Whilst devoted heart and soul to the service of the Church and the succoring of the poor he was seized, brought to Moscow and sentenced to death after a four-days' mock trial. The profession of Catholicism, held by the Socialistic judges as a crime against the state, was the only cause of his being condemned to the forfeiture of his life. A faithful imitator of the glorious martyr St. Josaphat, the Ruthenian Archbishop of Polotsk, Monsignor Budkiewicz met his fate with the unflinching courage of a Christian hero. The walls of the dungeon stained with his blood heard no shrieks of horror, but only the quietly whispered prayer on behalf of his executioners. He was murdered on Easter evening of March 31, 1923, a happy presage of his soul's triumphant victory at Eastertide. The numerous appeals for mercy from crowned rulers of Europe and Amer-

ica, and from the reigning Pontiff, Pius XI, were unheeded and repulsed by the Russian despots.

§ IV. The Schismatic Church Does Not Possess the Mark of Apostolicity

82. In the first place it is not bound to the Apostles by doctrine, for its doctrine has varied. During the first nine or rather ten and eleven centuries of the Catholic Church, the East as well as the West believed in the primacy of the Pope of Rome and in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, as we ourselves believe to this day. We will find most numerous and convincing proofs of this in the work of Pitzipios "L'Eglise orientale" (The Eastern Church) and in the "Bibliotheca græca orthodoxa" (The Greek Orthodox Library) of Assemani. Now the Greek Church, as we have proved (n. 77), no longer admits these two dogmas; it has therefore varied in its belief. It teaches that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, and that He rests in the Son; it makes the Personal distinction between the Son and the Holy Ghost consist in the *manner* of receiving divine existence, the one by generation, the other by procession, denying at the same time that this difference comes from the relation or origin.

We shall not speak of other points of divergence, Purgatory, for instance. In reality the difference between the two Churches, the Catholic and the Greek Schismatic Church of the East, consists in the *word* employed to designate this place of expiation. The Schismatics reject absolutely that of Purgatory, but they admit the reality of temporal expiation as well as the efficacy of prayer for the dead. This clearly appears from their liturgy, their canticles, the usages and the institutions of that Church. As to the Russian Schismatic Church, see what we stated above (n. 77) relative to this article of Catholic Faith.

It has not preserved the Apostolicity of ministry any better, as its revolt against the authority to which it had been so long respectfully submissive, broke the chain which attached it to

the Apostles by the lawful transmission of pastoral jurisdiction.

In closing what we had to say about the Greek Schism, we cannot but notice with pleasure the movement towards a return to Catholic unity, which is now beginning to show itself in the Russian Church. This movement is such that the historian Pogodine and many other Russian writers admit, perhaps with some exaggerations that, if religious liberty were granted to the Russians, half the Orthodox peasantry would at once pass over to the dissenting sects, to the Raskol, already a most powerful body in spite of persecution; but they add that half of the members belonging to the higher society would become Catholic. It is known that not long ago, a learned Russian, not a Catholic, Mr. Soloview, the son of the celebrated historian of that name, addressed a series of nine questions to an archpriest and through him to all the prelates of the Eastern Church not united to Rome. These questions, which show the preoccupation and doubt that disturb a number of distinguished men concerning the pretended orthodoxy of the Schismatic Church, seem to indicate a serious inclination towards a return to Catholic unity. The readers can find in a small volume by the same Mr. Soloview, "L'Idée russe" (The Russian Idea), the very significant judgment concerning his own Church pronounced by I. S. Aksakow, a declared enemy of the Roman Church. These are the terms in which the latter concludes his examination of the Russian Church, after having justified his opinion by a long series of undeniable facts. "The spirit of truth, the spirit of charity, the spirit of life, the spirit of liberty, these are the things which are wanting in the Russian Church." "Œuvres complètes d'Ivan Aksakow" (Complete works of Ivan Aksakow), vol. IV.

Let us multiply our prayers that the Russian people, so remarkable for its vigor, its religious spirit and its patriotism, may learn at last where it can find salvation from the social as well as from the religious point of view. Let them be convinced that no sacrifice of their national love and patriotism is asked of them; that the Pope thinks now less than ever of imposing upon them the rites and disciplinary customs of the

Latin Church. For the only thing the Russian Church is expected to do in order to effect a sincere union with Rome is to renew the broken chain of its ancient traditions, to return to the doctrine which was taught to it by the first Apostles of the Slavs, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, created Bishops by Pope Adrian II; to return to the doctrine of the most illustrious holy doctors of the East, Athanasius, the two Gregories, Chrysostom, Theodore Studitus, the two Cyrils, Ignatius of Constantinople, all inviolably united to the Roman See.

Let us close this article by repeating these consoling words of Leo XIII in his admirable Encyclical Letter to the Princes and Peoples of the Whole World *Præclara gratulationis*, of June 20, 1894: "We cannot forego the cheering hope that the time is not far distant, when the Churches of the East, so illustrious by the faith of their ancestors and their ancient glory, will return to their point of departure." "There is nothing," he further says to the Orientals, "which is of a nature to make you fear, as a consequence of this return (to Catholic unity), any curtailment of the rights, of the privileges of your patriarchates, of the rites and customs of your respective Churches. For it has always been and ever shall be the intention of the Apostolic See, as it has been one of its most constant traditions, to deal with every people with a great spirit of condescension, and to exhibit the greatest regard to their ancient usages and traditions."

83. Since the time (1901) when Father W. Devivier issued the sixteenth edition of his "Cours d'Apologétique Chrétienne," of which this work is a translation, many striking, calamitous events have taken place in Russia, particularly regarding the Orthodox Schismatic Church. The religious aspect of that old schism has reached such a deplorable state that the discussion whether it possesses any of the marks of the true Church of Christ appears to be now altogether needless. However, we deemed it advisable to leave that chapter untouched and to supplement it by the following additional notes, which serve to bring the question of the Eastern Schismatic Churches up to date.

One of the most poignant problems occupying the mind of

the Russian conservative Christians in our days is that of reunion with Rome: and certainly there is nothing that the Catholic Church will not do to win back these her wandering children save compromise in her essential rights or deny her divine commission to rule and to teach.

It is to be hoped that, with the tragic downfall of the Romanoffs, the inveterate enemies of Catholicism, and the replacement of the Soviet misrulers by a sane government, religious persecution will cease, and the return of many to the ancient Church will be made possible. We cannot, however, at this time, entertain the hope of a corporate reunion of the Russian Orthodox body with Rome. For the Russian Schismatic Church has practically ceased to exist as such, owing to the many splits brought about in its interior organization through disastrous political events.

Moreover, the process of conversion is much impeded, first by the confusion caused by the overtures of Anglicanism, at one with the Orthodox clergy and laity in the rejection of Papal Supremacy; secondly, by the proselytizing of various English and American sects, who mingle philanthropy (not charity) with their so-called religious zeal, and offer to the poverty stricken East material inducement to conversion, or rather heretical perversion far worse than the Eastern Schism.

The Soviet policy toward the Russian monks and their numerous monasteries has been one of systematic destruction. Banished from their cloister and thrown on the world to shift for themselves as they could, many of them begged to be received into the Catholic Church, in which they found a most hearty welcome. The reason why they so resolved was given with great candor by one of the eldest, as follows. "Our Lord Christ said that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church. We see how they have prevailed, and are still prevailing in our Orthodox Church. But His Church must exist somewhere, for the end of the world has not yet come. We feel sure somehow that His Church is yours." These religious, returning to the fold, are proving themselves efficient catechists for the instruction of the people, particularly in the vast country regions.

The main obstacle to the people's conversion is set by the leaders of the crumbling Orthodox Church. One of the Metropolitans issued the following ultimatum. "There can be no union between the Roman and the Orthodox Church on equal terms, but the former must submit unreservedly to the latter, and must abandon altogether the doctrine of Papal Supremacy: we claim for Orthodoxy the title of being the one and only Church of Christ." This is an old baseless claim: in fact similar views were expressed by an official of the now defunct Holy Synod to the late William Palmer, then a well-meaning Anglican, who had ventured to make to Russia overtures of union with the Established Church of England. He was received into the Catholic Church in the year 1855, and died at Rome in 1870. In one of the interviews the Russian Schismatic theologian thus addressed Mr. Palmer: "We know nothing about Unity, nothing about Catholicity; it is no term of ours; it had indeed a meaning once, it has none now. Our Church is not Catholic, it is Holy and Orthodox, also because it came from the East, whence Divine truth has ever issued, it is oriental. We know of no true Church, besides our own. We are the only Church in the world. The Latins are heretics or all but heretics; you are worse; you do not even know your name. There is no true Christianity in the world except in Russia, Greece and the Levant." (A Visit to the Russian Church. Kegan, London, 1882.)

If the speaker were to be alive this day, he would have to modify his language in a considerable degree.

But Orthodoxy makes no claim to infallible teaching; hence all such declarations, as stated above, degenerate into mere bombast and lose all their force. Their churches, formerly depending on Government support and visible protection, are now seen to crumble. It may be that God's Providence will take occasion of the political upheaval that has wrecked Czarist Russia and destroyed the Holy Synod to restore to His Church some of those hundred millions of Christians, whose continued defection has been such a disaster.

The *Orientalia Christiana*, a review of the Pontifical Institute, gives us the following estimate of the religious posi-

tion of the dissident East, as stated by its president, Father Michel d'Herbigny, S.J.:

The result of internal feud and external persecution is a religious chaos throughout the country, of which the reports published in the English and especially in the Anglican papers give no idea. Bad as is the religious condition of Great Russia, where Orthodoxy is falling to pieces, that of the other divisions of the Soviet Federation, the Caucasus, the Ukraine, Siberia is far worse. In the Caucasus Orthodox Christianity is often tainted with Mahometanism, Judaism, and even Paganism. In the Ukraine, which has over 40,000,000 inhabitants, all the Russian sects are battling with each other and there are found among the clergy individuals who possess no Sacred Orders and seem anxious to receive none. A short time ago an Ukrainian Archbishop of the so-called National Church was elected and installed by the will of the people, laymen imposing hands at the ceremony of consecration. Thus constituted this travesty of a Church is spreading throughout the whole of South Russia, deceiving thousands of unsophisticated among the peasant people particularly. More antidogmatic still are the new Orthodox sects of Siberia. Not satisfied with tampering and tinkering with the traditional liturgy, they have announced their intention of reforming all moral ideas of Christianity. They want more liberty in Faith as well as in morals. They mean to recast the whole of the Christian dogma, beginning by the rejection of the Creed of Nicea, and reforming the bond the old Church imposes on family life, which they hold to be narrow and unyielding. But for these and other religious aberrations we must not blame the bulk of the Russian people, who are simple and devout, ready to be taught and to serve God according to Christian principles. The guilty perpetrators of the high-handed rebellion are their spiritual guides, associated in this work of demolition with their despotic rulers. Consciences were perplexed enough in England when Tudor tyranny and cringing ecclesiastical servility combined to upset the old religion and rob the people of the ancient Faith. Then, as the late Father Bridgett wrote, only one member of the English

Hierarchy was found faithful to the truth. Blessed John Fisher of Rochester stood alone in his refusal to incur the guilt of schism. It is the evil example of cowardly pastors that is now confounding the helpless multitudes of the poor Russians. Unless the Catholic Church can come to the aid of the East in its dire extremity, there is every likelihood of Greco-Slav Christianity and with it the civilization of eastern Europe dissolving into atheism and anarchy. The conflicting sects of Protestantism cannot help; they will only make confusion worse confounded. The Church alone that is founded on a rock can save those who are struggling in the quicksands of error, befogged by human passion and prejudice. Now more than ever the prayers of Catholics should be raised to Heaven in behalf of the Russian people and their distracted country. (Adapted from "The Decay of Russian Orthodoxy," a thoughtful article by Fr. Keating, S.J., editor of *The Month,* in the January number, 1924.)

84. To give some kind of completeness to our account of the present both religious and social conditions of Russia we add these items from a very recent book by Captain Francis McCullagh entitled "The Bolshevist Persecution of Christianity" (Murray, London):

The campaign of the Soviet Government against the Church, and even against Almighty God, has not ceased. . . . The Bolshevik leaders still utter their blasphemous boast: "We have finished with the earthly Tsars; now we shall deal with the heavenly Tsars."

The church buildings throughout Russia are disappearing at a terrible rate. Thousands of shrines are crumbling out of existence, for not a ruble is available for repairing them. Local Soviets love to demolish churches "for reason of traffic." In December, 1922, as many as fifty churches were doomed to destruction in Moscow alone. These disastrous measures show once more the utter collapse of the Russian Church, and the very formidable power of blind, fanatic nationalism as a most serious obstacle to reunion. But this is not all. All religious instruction is forbidden, even in private houses, to all persons under the age of 18. A circular issued in January,

1922, states officially, "Prosecution with all the rigor of revolutionary laws will follow any attempt to teach a Russian lad or lass the doctrines of Christianity." The French Revolution itself produced no monster worse than the Procurator—criminal attorney—Krylenko. At the trial of Archbishop Zepliak (since released from prison) he yelled: "I spit on your religion, and I do so on all religions." This is atheism gone mad, the creature of Soviet tyranny.

CHAPTER V

THE PRIMACY OF THE SEE OF PETER, OR THE PAPACY

84. This question should naturally find its place in the first chapter of Part VII, in which we treat of the prerogatives of the Church and of her Supreme Head. We take it up here, because the primacy of the Roman Pontiff offers a new mark of truth, *sufficient in itself,* to distinguish the true Church of Jesus Christ from *all heretical and schismatic sects.*

Above all, it is necessary to distinguish three kinds or degrees of primacy, that of jurisdiction, that of honor, and the primacy of simple directive authority.

Primacy of honor is a mere right to precedence; it does not confer the power to govern, nor even to direct. The power of directive authority is the right to regulate the discussion of affairs, like that possessed by chairmen in deliberative assemblies. Quite different is the primacy of jurisdiction; it is a true right *to govern,* which includes a threefold power, legislative, judicial and executive.

Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter the full right to govern, or the primacy of jurisdiction; it is this primacy which is denied by Protestants and Greek Schismatics.

Let us then prove: I. That Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter the primacy of jurisdiction over the Universal Church. II. That He intended that this primacy should be transmitted

to his successors. III. That the Church of Rome, and she alone, possesses the primacy of the See of Peter.

FIRST THESIS.—Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter the primacy of Jurisdiction over the whole Church.

85. First Argument, taken from the words of Jesus Christ. Among the words of Jesus Christ addressed to St. Peter, there are some which contain *the promise* to give him the primacy of jurisdiction, and there are others that contain the performance or practical fulfillment or execution of this promise.

a. The Promise. Jesus having asked of all the disciples who were about Him, what they thought of His person, Peter alone, in his own name, openly proclaimed the divinity of the Savior: *"Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."* Pleased at this profession of Faith, Jesus at once made answer to him who had pronounced it: *"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father, who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."* (Matt. 16, 16–19.)

It is very evident that here it is to Peter and not to the whole Apostolic body that Jesus addresses Himself. Incarnate Wisdom could not indeed express itself in ambiguous terms, when there was question of a promise of such importance. The Master spoke to make Himself understood, and He desired that there should be no misunderstanding of His words. That Protestants should endeavor to explain these words in quite a different manner from us, no one need wonder; for to accept the natural and obvious sense of the text would be fatal to their claims. It would be a suicidal act.

It is well to remark that in this text, whose meaning is so clear, Protestants, by following their system of private interpretation, have succeeded in discovering at least ten meanings not only different from but opposed to and destructive of each other. Thus, some hold that our Lord addressed Himself, not

to Peter, but to the entire Apostolic body. Others claim that in saying: "Upon this rock" He meant *His own person.* In truth, this would be a very singular, a very unexpected recompense granted to the faith of Peter, and announced in such solemn terms. Then why should the Savior have spoken in the future tense: "I will build?" And who does not see, moreover, that the words "I will build" and "I will give," are closely bound together as well by their meaning as by the particle "and," and that if one of these two verbs designates Peter, the other must likewise designate him?

The paramount importance of this question *requires* that we should enter into a few developments. Let us at first observe that it is to the same Peter that these two words refer: *"Thou art Peter"* and *"upon this rock."* In the Latin language the masculine word Peter—*Petrus* is changed into the feminine word *Petra*—a rock, and in English the masculine term Peter is changed into the neuter word rock; but it is not the same in the Syro-Chaldaic language, which the Savior used, and in most of the Eastern versions; for in these languages it is absolutely the same word which is repeated: "Thou art a *rock* and upon this *rock.*" Moreover, the demonstrative pronoun *"this,"* upon *this* rock, which is found in all the texts, clearly shows that the question concerns Peter. As to the pronoun *"it,"* which closes the text, whether it means the rock or the Church, the general sense does not change; for, if according to the promise of Jesus Christ, the power of the devil will never be able to prevail against the Church, it is because the Church is built upon Peter. This rock is established as the foundation of the spiritual edifice.

Let us now show that it is really *the fullness of power* that the Savior promises to Peter. In fact, the foundation upon which a perfect society rests cannot be anything else than the supreme authority which governs it. As it is to the character of its foundation that a building owes its solidity, the close union of its parts, and even its very existence, it is likewise from the authority of Peter that the Church derives her unity, her stability, and even her existence itself. The Church, therefore, cannot exist without Peter.

As St. Ambrose (A.D. 397) said, echoing the tradition of the Christian centuries that preceded him, "*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia:*" Where Peter is, there is the Church. As if he said, "where the living trunk is, there is the tree," where the center is, there is the circle; where is the foundation, there is also the edifice; where the throne stands, there exists the empire; and where the Church is, there is Christ, her Founder; and where Christ is, there is salvation; for as St. Peter himself spoke (Acts 4, 12): "*Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved.*"

But to secure the result desired by the Savior, this authority must be full and entire; it must comprise the threefold power, legislative, judicial and coercive or executive; in other words, Peter shall be invested with the primacy, not only of honor, but moreover and especially with the primacy of jurisdiction. His authority will extend over the whole Church, over the Apostles as well as over the Faithful. It is not a portion only of His Church that Jesus gives him to govern, that of Rome, for instance, that of Antioch, it is *His* Church, it is the religious society which He has founded.

The following words, registered immediately after the text of St. Matthew quoted above, and which were also addressed to Peter alone, are no less conclusive in support of his primacy: "*And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*" (Matt. 16, 19.) Everyone knows that in the language of the Sacred Scripture as in other languages, and especially in the Eastern expression, the deliverance of the keys of the kingdom means granting supreme power, complete sovereignty. Jesus desires that this power be exercised over all the members of His Church without exception, over the leaders, bishops and priests, as well as over the Faithful; for it is really the Church that in this passage, as in many others, is designated under the name of the kingdom of heaven.

86. Objection. To escape the cogency of the peremptory

argument in favor of the primacy of Peter, drawn from the text of St. Matthew, it might be said that the power to bind and loose, here promised to Peter alone, was granted later to all the Apostles.

We might thence conclude, it would seem, that the promise made to Peter in the present instance had not as its object a more extended power than that which was to be granted later on to the other Apostles.

Answer. To prove that this conclusion is wrong, it suffices to observe that Jesus Christ, in addressing Peter alone and in such a solemn manner, does not promise him only the power to bind and loosen, but He further and at the very outset promises to make him, Peter, *the foundation* of His Church and to give to him *the keys* of the kingdom of heaven. Evidently this promise, made as a reward for his profession of Faith, and in such expressive terms, cannot be without meaning. It must therefore contain something more than the simple promise of the power to bind and to loosen; it evidently implies the *primacy* or highest privilege in the exercise of this power.

All can bind and loosen, but not all *in the same manner.* Peter, who first and alone received this promise, will receive this power *in its fullness* and without any restriction or limitation; he will exercise it even over the other Apostles; they will receive it, also, but after Peter, secondarily and not over him. Moreover, it is the *traditional teaching,* which Bossuet in his celebrated discourse on the Unity of the Church sets forth when he says: "It was evidently the intention of Jesus Christ to confide at first to one person alone the power which later on He wished to entrust to many: but the subsequent act of the divine Savior and Master does not reverse the previous one, and the first does not lose its place. The promises of Jesus Christ as well as His gifts are without repentance, and therefore not subject to revocation, and that which is once given indefinitely and universally is irrevocable; moreover, the power given to many persons suffers restriction by being divided, whilst power given to one person alone over all and without any exception implies plenitude of power."

If there remains any reasonable doubt as to the meaning of the words of Jesus Christ, He Himself removes it at the moment that He fulfills His promise.

87. b. Fulfillment of the Promise. After His Resurrection, Jesus Christ appears to several of His Apostles on the borders of the Lake of Tiberias. Thrice he asks of the Apostle who has thrice denied Him, of Peter alone, the question: "*Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?*" Peter answers these questions with a triple and touching protestations of love. Then Jesus addresses him in these solemn and decisive words: "*Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.*" (John 21, 15, 16–17.) It is known that in the Greek text the word "feed" means to rule, to govern. Here then we have Peter, and Peter alone, appointed shepherd of the fold of Jesus Christ, and the authority which he receives is in nowise limited. And yet more; at the very time that Jesus designates the whole Church under the figure of a *flock,* He explicitly distinguishes in this flock the *lambs* from the *sheep,* indicating under the first name the members of the flock, and under the second those who engender them unto spiritual life and who are to guide and to feed them, that is, the bishops and priests. As He places Peter at the head of all the flock, Jesus Christ confers upon him by this act the most extended powers, the primacy of jurisdiction. "Every one," says Bossuet, "is subjected to the keys given to Peter, all, kings and people, shepherd and flock. It is to Peter that the injunction is made first to love more than all the other Apostles, and then to feed and rule all, the lambs and the sheep, the young as well as their mothers, and the shepherds themselves; shepherds with respect to the people, sheep with respect to Peter."

88. Second Argument, derived from the facts related in Scripture. In the Gospels and in the Acts, Peter always appears as the first and the leader of the other Apostles without there ever arising thereby any protest from any of the others. Thus St. Matthew, in enumerating the Apostles, is not satisfied with naming Peter in the first place, though he was not the first called to the Apostleship, but he expressly says that Peter *is the first: "Now the names of the twelve*

Apostles are these: The first Simon, who is called Peter." (Matt. 10, 2.) After the Ascension of the Savior, it is Peter whom we see calling, presiding over and directing the assembly at which St. Matthias is elected; it is he that first preaches the Gospel to the Jews; it is he that receives the order to baptize Cornelius and open the Church to the Gentiles; it is he that punishes Ananias and Saphira for the falsehood they uttered, and confounds Simon the Magician; it is he that affirms before the tribunal his right and his mission to preach, and who performs the first miracle in confirmation of the new religion; first also, he speaks to the Council at Jerusalem; and all the assembly "*having heard these things, held their peace*" (Acts 11, 18); cast into prison, he absorbs the attention of all the Church, and "*prayer was made without ceasing by the Church to God for him*" (Acts 12, 5), until his miraculous delivery; it is he who founds the See of Antioch, which for that reason became a patriarchal See; finally it is he who founds the See of Rome, and it is *because he died Bishop of that city* that his legitimate successors have always had and always will have the primacy in the universal Church.

89. Third Argument, drawn from Tradition. The Holy Fathers agree in interpreting the above texts in the sense of a true primacy of jurisdiction given to Peter. The limits of this book do not permit us to develop this important proof. We cannot, however, dispense ourselves from setting forth a few texts, borrowed principally from the first centuries, during which, according to Protestants themselves, the Church of Jesus Christ preserved the pure doctrine of Christ. These texts are so clear and explicit as to render comment unnecessary. Hear Tertullian: "Nothing could be hidden from Peter, called the rock, as it was upon him as upon a foundation stone that the Church was built; from Peter I say, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with power to bind and to loosen on earth and in heaven." In another place he says that "The Lord gave the keys to Peter, and by Peter to the Church." (Præscrips. No. 22, Scorp.)

Origen declares that "though the Church is built upon all the Apostles, Peter nevertheless is her principal foundation

and the very solid rock upon which Christ has built her." "Peter received the supreme power to feed the sheep." (Hom. 5 on the book of Exodus; Hom. on the letter to the Rom.) "Though our Lord," adds the same writer "gave to all the Apostles the power to bind and to loosen, yet, in order that unity should come from the authority of one person alone, He spoke to Peter and to him alone, when He said: *'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'* "

We could supply the testimony of Eusebius of Cæsarea, St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ephrem, St. Epiphanius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Eucher, Bishop of Lyons, and many other Fathers and writers of the IVth and Vth centuries; but we must quote the following explicit text of St. Leo the Great: "Peter alone was chosen to be placed at the head of all the Apostles and all the Fathers of the Church. Though there are many priests among the people of God, yet Peter rules them all as Christ governs them in the first place. It is a great and wonderful part of His divine power that God in his exceeding goodness gives to this man; if God wished to impart some of it to the other leaders in the Church, it was always through Peter that they received what God did not refuse them." (Serm. III.)

SECOND THESIS.—Jesus intended that the primacy should be transmitted to the successors of Peter.

90. This thesis has already been proven when we treated of the Apostolicity of the ministry (n. 28). Let us, however, set forth a few decisive reasons which specially concern the primacy of the See of Rome.

The form of government, or the organization given to the Church by Jesus Christ, can be modified only by Himself. But Jesus Christ, in founding the Church, has established a primacy; no person has the right to tamper with it, much less to suppress it. It must therefore always subsist, not in St. Peter alone, who was to die, but in all his lawful successors.

Moreover, the text of St. Matthew puts forth the primacy of St. Peter as the foundation of the Church, without which she cannot subsist. For it is this primacy that is to maintain in the Church unity of government, purity of doctrine, sanctity of morals; it is, in a word, upon it that the stability and efficacy of the divine work depend. The foundation of an edifice, and especially of an edifice of this nature, must necessarily *last* as long as the edifice itself, that is to say, according to the divine promise, until the end of time. But Jesus knew full well that Peter was not to live always. He, therefore, evidently intended that his ministry, his primacy should be perpetuated until the consummation of ages in his legitimate successors.

To prove the primacy of St. Peter and that of his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, we might appeal to all ecclesiastical history. It would then be seen that from the beginning of the Church, and in all the centuries since then, the most positive facts and the most certain testimonies attest the belief of pastors and flock in the primacy of the See of Rome. We do not think it necessary to enlarge upon these historical facts, which are, moreover, to be found in a multitude of books. Let us cite in particular the 69th Conference of Father Olivier. "We should never end," says he, "if we were to cite all the appeals to Rome from the East as well as from the West, either to implore the support of the Pope in the struggle against error, or to obtain from him the re-establishment on their Sees of Bishops unjustly deposed, or finally to consult him upon doubtful questions concerning Faith or discipline. . . . What would suffice to prove the primacy of the Popes is the fact that never, in the East or in the West, was any council whatsoever, even among the greatest, ever recognized as ecumenical, that is, representing the universal Church, unless it had been convoked at least implicitly by the Pope, and also presided either by himself or by his legates or confirmed by him. . . . As the concurrence of the Popes was considered essential by the whole Church, the whole Church acknowledged, by that very fact, the Papal primacy of power and jurisdiction."

Remark. It results from the two preceding theses that the jurisdiction or power of the Popes is *general* and not restricted to determined cases. Jesus Christ did not impose any restriction when He made Peter the foundation of His Church and the shepherd of His flock. He wished that this Church should always find her stability in her foundation, and that the flock should always obey its shepherd. Undoubtedly, in the interest of good government itself, the Popes generally exert their jurisdiction only to direct and to oversee, leaving to the Bishops that initiative and liberty of action which assure to subordinate administrations all their efficacy in the details of government. Hence, the rights conferred upon them by the Supreme Pastor of souls, Jesus Christ, are preserved unimpaired.

91. The whole doctrine on the primacy of jurisdiction granted by Christ to St. Peter and his legitimate successors is ably summed up by Dr. Ludwig Pastor in his first volume of the "History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages," pp. 179–181.

"It was the will of Christ that the whole Church should have a single, visible Head, so that, by the mutual connection of all the members among themselves, and by the subjection of all these members under one head, the most perfect unity should subsist. Therefore, a short time before His Ascension, our Savior, according to His promise (St. Matt. 16, 17–19), appointed the Apostle Peter, after his threefold profession of love, to be His Vicar on earth, the foundation and centre of the Church, the shepherd of 'the lambs and the sheep,' that is to say, of the whole multitude of the redeemed on earth, as related by St. John (21, 15 et seq.).

"The primacy conferred on St. Peter, according to the teaching of the Church, is not merely a primacy of precedence and honour, but one of supreme jurisdiction, of complete spiritual power and authority. Inasmuch as Christ committed this power immediately and directly to St. Peter, he holds it for the Church, but not *from* her; he is not her representative and delegate, but her divinely appointed Head.

"Neither the primacy nor the Church is a transitory insti-

tution. St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, there he died a martyr's death under Nero. It is an article of the Catholic Faith, that all his prerogatives and powers are by divine appointment transmitted to his lawful successors in the See of Rome. This plenitude of power was from the first contained in the Papacy, but was, of course, manifested only in such measure as the needs of the Church and the circumstances of the time required.

"The Bishops of Rome, as direct successors of the Prince of the Apostles, according to Catholic teaching, possess by divine appointment, the plenitude of episcopal power over the Universal Church. Supreme, full, and lawful spiritual authority over all the Faithful is theirs. In virtue of this supreme authority, all her members, including Bishops, are subject to the Pope; subject, whether we view them as isolated individuals, or as assembled in Council. Far from subjecting the Pope to a Council, the early Church held it as a principle that the supreme authority could be judged by no one. A General Council cannot exist without the Pope or in opposition to him, for, as Head of the Church, he is the necessary and essential head of the General Council, whose decrees receive their ecumenical validity solely from his confirmation. As supreme legislator, the Pope can, in matters of discipline, revise and change the decrees of a General Council, as well as those of his predecessors. Former ecclesiastical legislation forms a precedent for his action, in so far as he, being the superior, is by his own example to show respect to the law. The power of the primacy also contains, comprehended within itself, the supreme judicial power. Appeal may accordingly be made to him in all ecclesiastical matters; there is no appeal from his judgment to another tribunal; the plenitude of power over the Universal Church, conferred on the Holy See, is limited by nothing but divine and natural law."

THIRD THESIS.—It is the Church of Rome that possesses the primacy of the See of Peter.

First Argument. The Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter.

92. It would seem that no question or reasonable doubt could possibly arise as to this fact. It is clearly evident that the Catholic Church, and she alone, obeys the successor of St. Peter, the first overruling Pastor given to the Church by Jesus Christ Himself. Tradition and history offer us, concerning the coming of Peter to Rome, a mass of evidence so overwhelming and so clear, that for twelve centuries no one ever dreamt of raising any doubt concerning his residence in Rome.

After the Waldenses, who were, it seems, the first to controvert this historical fact, Protestants naturally followed their example and called it in question, as it was of great importance to them in their controversies with Catholics, being really a matter of life or death with the Reformers. In consequence they have done everything to disprove it, and after them the modern unbelievers have spared no labor to overthrow this truth, so well proven by the documents and made still more certain by the literary labors which these attacks have brought forth. It would be well, we think, to notice briefly some of the arguments supplied by the most authentic documents.

The Episcopate of St. Peter at Rome is a most important event from both the theological and the apologetical point of view. For, though the fact itself strictly belongs to the domain of history, yet it is, at the same time, intimately connected with the dogma of the primacy of the Roman Pontiffs. If, by divine right and by the express will of Jesus Christ, the Sovereign Pontiff succeeds to St. Peter, and possesses the primacy over the whole Church, what has attributed to the Bishops of Rome the right of being the legitimate successors of St. Peter, is, according to Catholic Tradition, an historical fact, viz.: the sojourn, the Episcopate, and the death of the Prince of the Apostle in Rome. This remark suffices to make us comprehend the gravity of the question in which we are presently engaged. If St. Peter had no definite Episcopal See at Rome, it is all over with the fundamental reason invoked by the whole Christian Tradition to prove that the Roman Pontiffs are the lawful successors and inheritors of the Prince of the Apostles.

This explains the reason of the bitter and persistent opposition of Protestantism to this undeniable fact.

93. I. The Prince of the Apostles himself can serve as a witness. In his first Epistle (5, 13), addressed to the Christians of Asia Minor, he says in closing: "*The church which is in Babylon, . . . saluteth you and so doth my son, Mark.*" This name of Babylon evidently means here, as well as in various places in the Apocalypse, the City of Rome, looked upon at that time by the Jews as the centre of impiety, as old Babylon of the East had been by the Jews of the Captivity. It is in this sense that the Fathers of the Church have always understood it. Renan himself is fully of their opinion, as well as the Protestants Grotius, Cave, Lardner, etc. Moreover, the arguments used by learned unbelievers to combat this ancient tradition, and to prove the Babylon of St. Peter's Epistle to be a city of the East, do not bear serious examination.

We cite in proof of our statement some passages from two recent standard Protestant Commentaries on the New Testament: 1st. "The Speaker's Commentary," edited by the Archbishop of York, in its note on the first letter of St. Peter, 5, 13, says: "All ancient authorities are unanimous in the assertion that the later years of Peter's life were passed in the West of the Roman Empire. Here we have to encounter the *uniform, unvarying testimony of early Christian writers.* From whatever quarter their voices reach us, they affirm that the Babylon mentioned by St. Peter is here a recognized appellation of Rome. In fact, no other view of the passage was entertained or suggested before Calvin. The presence and martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome are mentioned by [the non-Catholic writers] Credner, Bleek, Wieseler, Meyer, Hilgenfield, Mangold, Thiersch, Ewald, and nearly all unbiassed critics." Calvin himself (Inst., book IV, ch. vi, § 15) later on wrote as follows: "I no longer question the fact of the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome, which is unanimously attested by all historians."

2nd. "The Bible Commentary," edited by Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, speaks thus: "The whole subject, has, of late years, been sifted to the bottom by various

German and other writers. . . . Though every conceivable difference may be found between these authors respecting the dates and duration of St. Peter's sojourn in Rome, very few are so hardily skeptical as to reject altogether evidence as strong, early and wide as that on which we believe that Hannibal invaded Italy." See "Cathedra Petri," by C. F. B. Allnatt.

II. At the end of the first century, St. Clement, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 90), and a disciple of St. Peter himself, speaking of the Faithful put to death by Nero after the burning of Rome, names among the number St. Peter and St. Paul, and he adds these significant words: "They were a great example among us; it is here that they bore the outrages of men and suffered all kinds of torture." It is known that the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians is the earliest Christian writing, next to the inspired Scriptures, that has come down to us.

Forty years after the death of St. Peter, Ignatius, brought from Antioch to Rome, to be made the prey of wild beasts in the Amphitheater, addresses to the Romans this touching prayer: "I beg of you, do not show me kindness out of season; let me become the food of wild beasts. . . . I do not command you as St. Peter and St. Paul; they were Apostles, I am only a condemned prisoner." These words have no meaning unless it be admitted that the two Apostles governed the Roman Church.

In this connection it is edifying to recall the remarkable words uttered by this indomitable Martyr before being devoured by the wild beasts in the Roman Amphitheater: "*Frumentum Christi sum, dentibus leonum molar, ut panis dignus efficiar*" (I am the wheat of Christ; I shall be ground by the lion's teeth that I may become good bread.)

If in the first days of Christianity we find few explicit testimonies of the sojourn of St. Peter in Rome, there is nothing in it to suprise us. Besides, but few writings of that epoch have come down to us, and no one at that time dreamed of doubting such a notorious fact, neither did they think it necessary to attest it; it is not during times of persecution that writers concern themselves about plain and undeniable facts.

Hence, it is only incidentally that they happen to mention the residence of Peter in the Eternal City.

III. A century after the death of St. Peter, the tradition of the sojourn and martyrdom of the Prince of the Apostles at Rome was universal. Renan himself acknowledges it. "Everybody," says he, "admits that at the close of the second century, the general belief of Christian Churches was that St. Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome." This is what is said by Tertullian, who lived at Rome at the end of the second century. "Glance over the Apostolic Churches, you will find the very sees which the Apostles occupied, each in its place. If you are near Italy, you have Rome. Oh! fortunate Church, to whom the Apostles gave their doctrine and their blood, where Peter suffered the death of the Master." "If you go to the Vatican or on the Ostian Way (*Via Ostia*)," wrote Caius, under the pontificate of Zephyrinus (A.D. 202–218), you will find the tombs of those who founded this Church." In another place, he says that Eleutherius (A.D. 177) "was the thirteenth Bishop of Rome since St. Peter." St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons and disciple of St. Polycarp, who received the teachings of St. John, mentions twice, in his treatise against the heretics, that Peter and Paul founded the Roman Church. The same language is held by St. Denis of Corinth (A.D. 162), Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 217), Origen (A.D. 254). St. Cyprian, martyred in the year 258, gives the name of Chair of Peter to the Roman Church.

It is useless to cite the Fathers of later times; they are unanimous in their assertion.

94. The testimony of the Fathers of the Church, whose unanimity cannot be accounted for otherwise than by the Apostolic Tradition, faithfully preserved through the flight of time, is further strengthened by the authority of the General or Ecumenical Councils, which are the authentic voice of the Universal Church. We shall only quote the first four Councils, which have always been regarded by both the Eastern and Western Churches with special veneration, and considered to be almost equal to the four Gospels.

The Council of Nice (Nicea—now called Isnich, in Asia Minor, about 90 miles from Constantinople), held A.D. 325, attests, in plain terms that the Church of *Rome always had the primacy.* It was so true that here it was question of primacy of jurisdiction, that the Council of Sardica, an appendix or continuation of that of Nice, acknowledges that a Bishop deposed by the episcopal Council of a province has the right to appeal to the Pope. For the texts of the Councils, see the great work of the Jesuit writer, Philip Labbe, in 18 folio volumes. (See "Nomenclator Literarius," by H. Hurter, S.J., vol. 2, pp. 180–189.)

The second General Council, held at Constantinople in 381, also places the Bishop of Rome before the Bishop of Constantinople, the imperial city. In 431, the Bishops assembled for the third time in Ecumenical Council, declared at Ephesus that if they deposed the heresiarch Nestorius, it was because they were obliged thereto by the holy canons and by the letters of the Most Holy Father Leo I, Bishop of the Church of Rome. Then, in 451, the Council of Chalcedon, whose testimony is too long to cite, is still more explicit. We shall only say that on the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, being read, all the Bishops exclaimed: "*This is the belief of our Fathers, this is the belief of the Apostles. It is thus that we believe; it is thus that all orthodox Christians believe. Anathema to him who will not so believe! It is Peter who has spoken to us through Leo.*" And then, the confirmation of the acts of the Council is asked for from the Pope "*in order that he may supply by his authority that which may be wanting to the authority of his children.*"

It is unnecessary to speak of Councils which followed, whose doctrine on the point at issue is undoubted. Let us recall, however, that of Florence, held in 1439, in which the *Greeks* as well as the Latins subscribed to the following decree of Pope Eugenius IV: "We define that the Holy Apostolic See, viz., the Roman Pontiff, has the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole world; that this same Roman Pontiff is the successor of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles; that he is the Vicar of Jesus Christ and the Head of the whole Church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and that he

has received from our Lord, in the person of the blessed Peter, full power to feed, rule and govern the Universal Church, *as it is declared in the acts of the Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Canons.*" The last words of the decree are those of the Latin text, which is clearer than the Greek text; it must not be forgotten that the Latin is the original text, first subscribed to by the Fathers of the Council.

Let us in the last place hear the words of the Vatican Council, in the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church (ch. iii). After renewing and developing the definition of the Council of Florence, it adds: "If any one say that the Roman Pontiff has only a power of supervision or direction, and not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only as to what concerns Faith and morals, but also as to what refers to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the whole world; or else that he has only a principal part of that power and not its entire plenitude; or finally that the power which he possesses is not ordinary and immediate either over all the Churches and each of them, or over all the pastors and Faithful and each of them, let him be anathema."

IV. The most ancient catalogues which enumerate the succession of the Roman Pontiffs all agree in placing St. Peter at the head of the list. Such are the catalogues of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Optatus of Mileve. Eusebius, who borrows his list from the "Memoirs" of Hegesippus (A.D. 175–187), writes in his history: "The first after Peter, Linus, became Bishop of the Roman Church; Clement was the third."

V. The same attestation comes from the ancient monuments, the medals and the paintings of the first centuries. According to de Rossi, it is veritably the episcopal chair of St. Peter, the seat which he used in sacred ceremonies, that is venerated at Rome as a precious relic. The author of the poem against Marcion, at the beginning of the third century, speaks of "the very chair where Peter was seated and upon which he had commanded that Linus should be the first to occupy that seat after himself." Tertullian expresses himself in the same manner concerning the episcopal throne of Peter.

VI. Against the constant tradition of the first centuries

no contrary tradition can be brought forward; no city, with the exception of Antioch, ever prided itself with having had at any time St. Peter as first pastor; nowhere, except at Rome, men ever thought of showing the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles. Though the Ebionite and Gnostic Apocryphal books have related a thousand fables about St. Peter, no one ever ventured to place the See of his episcopate outside of Rome.

Lastly, among so many heretics and schismatics of all times, no one until the appearance of the Waldenses, or rather, it may be said, until the time of the Reformers in the XVIth century, expressed any doubt as to the general belief in this historical fact, the sojourn and martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome. Let us add, that among Protestants there are many, and these among the most learned, who admit with us the sojourn of St. Peter in the Eternal City. We shall mention in particular Cave, Grotius, Ussher, Basnage, Scaliger, Neander.

Let us add that the coming and death of St. Peter in Rome, which were formerly looked upon as legends and fables by the majority of Rationalists, are to-day almost universally admitted as real events, so that many Protestants themselves, such as Zahn, Lightfoot, and the learned Anglican bishop of Durham, have largely contributed by their investigations to the triumph of truth. After the admission of such facts on the part of the enemies of the Papacy themselves, it matters little, if the sojourn of the Prince of the Apostles in the eternal city is not considered as long as it was formerly believed. In recent times it was the School of Baur, a Tübingen professor, that tried to destroy this immemorial and very general tradition, but with no success. In the words of the German Professor Harnack, no friend to the Papacy (Chron., p. 244): "It was first Protestant bias, then biassed critical prejudice, that denied St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome. That it was a mistake is to-day apparent to every student who is not blinded. The whole critical apparatus, by means of which Baur contested the old tradition, is to-day justly considered worthless."

The following item taken from *The Fortnightly Review* (St. Louis, Feb. 20, 1902), is to the point: "There militates

against this theory another mass of evidence—proof that cannot be obliterated, viz.; the records in brass and stone that have been and are daily brought to light in the Eternal City. Father H. Grisar, S.J., has collected them in his 'Geschichte Roms und der Papste,' (History of Rome and the Popes), Freiburg, Herder; 1901. Vol. 1, pp. 219–239 of this splendid work, contains an exhaustive treatise on the sepulchre of St. Peter. Whatever has been brought to light by the numerous excavations bears testimony to the fact that St. Peter was buried in Rome. The same Father Grisar (p. 225), quoting Lanciani, says: 'For the archeologist, the presence and execution of St. Peter and Paul in Rome are facts established beyond the shadow of a doubt by purely monumental evidence.' ''

On seeing the forcible testimony on behalf of this historical truth, a testimony dug out of the very bowels of the earth, we are reminded of those words of our Blessed Redeemer in St. Luke's Gospel (19, 40): *''I say to you that if these should hold their peace, the stones will cry out.''*

Lastly, Father Kneller, S.J., in a recent pamphlet establishes this thesis: ''Aside from the facts related in Holy Scripture, there is none in the history of the early Church so well authenticated as St. Peter's stay and martyrdom at Rome'' (p. 5). And he confirms his thesis by quoting more than two dozen prominent non-Catholic authors of different nationalities, who uphold Peter's presence at Rome.

Hence, it is incontestable that Peter, put to a martyr's death in the year 69, came to Rome and died there the Bishop of that city.

We can even fix the year 42 as the year of the arrival of the Apostle in the city of the Cæsars. This is attested in the first part of the Catalogue of Liberius, by the historian Paulus Orosius, a writer of the IVth century, the historian Eusebius, whose ''Chronicle'' was written about the year 310, and St. Jerome, likewise of the IVth century (A.D. 370–420).

This is the unequivocal testimony of this distinguished Doctor in his book (De viris illustr., c. 1). ''Simon Peter, Prince of the Apostles, after his episcopacy over the Church

of Antioch, and after preaching . . . in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia, goes to Rome in the 2nd year of Claudius to defeat Simon, the Magician, and *there he held the episcopal chair twenty-five years* down to the last year of Nero, . . . under whom he also suffered martyrdom, being crucified with his head downward. . . . He was buried at Rome on the Vatican Hill, near the Triumphal Way, and is honored with the veneration of the whole city."

According to the illustrious archeologist de Rossi, ancient monuments fully confirm this date.

It is, moreover, to be particularly remarked that there is no ancient author nor any monument which contradicts, either directly or indirectly, the twenty-five years of the episcopate of St. Peter; and the learned Bollandist Ch. De Smedt, in his "Dissertationes," does not hesitate to conclude that the opinion attributing to St. Peter twenty-five years of episcopate at Rome "is by far the most probable."

It must not, however, be thought that during all this period St. Peter lived in Rome uninterruptedly, viz., *without ever going away from it.* The contrary is altogether probable. Indeed, there is in Lactantius (A.D. 325), in particular and the Catalogue of Felix IV (A.D. 526), distinct mention of a second voyage to Rome by St. Peter under the Emperor Nero.

The series of the succession from St. Peter to Pius XI is known to us. Therefore it is Rome, and consequently the Roman Catholic Church, that possesses the See of Peter. No sect, indeed, has ever claimed that honor.

It follows logically from this single fact that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church, for she alone possesses *the center and the foundation; she alone preserves the original organization in all her integrity.*

As the author of that excellent little manual, "Catholic Belief," wisely remarks: "In the face of millions of Catholics recognizing, generation after generation, the Bishops of Rome as the successors of St. Peter in that See; in the face of the most ancient and most illustrious of all dynasties the regular line of 257 Roman Pontiffs (A.D. 1902), who have at all times

claimed to succeed to the chair of Peter; and in the face of a large number of historians (many of them non-Catholic, and even hostile to the Roman Church), who have borne witness to the same fact, without a single ancient writer asserting the contrary,'' how utterly insignificant, not to say ridiculous, appear the puny efforts of some Protestant writers, who attempt to question the fact that St. Peter was ever in Rome. As it has happened in other instances that the bitter attacks of our adversaries only served to bring out the Catholic truth in greater relief, so it is in this case. The denial by modern Protestants that St. Peter was ever in Rome only gave an opportunity both to Catholics and to fair-minded non-Catholic historians to bring forth a host of historical documents in proof of this part of general belief.

Lindsay, an indefatigable writer, in order to prove the Supremacy of St. Peter and his legitimate successors, quotes in his ''Evidence for the Papacy'' an overwhelming array of testimony from the words of the Fathers of the first five centuries of Christianity, the period during which the Church, as Protestants themselves hold, had maintained in its purity and integrity the doctrine of Jesus Christ. His 140 quotations are directed to demonstrate the following points:

1. The primacy of both honor and jurisdiction granted by Christ to Peter.

2. Peter is the Rock on which Christ built His Church.

3. Peter is the solid, unshaken foundation sustaining the whole edifice of Christ's Church.

4. Peter divinely constituted and held by the Faithful the Vicar, Vicegerent or Representative of Christ.

5. The Church, who is said to have been founded on the Apostles (Eph. 2, 20), is also founded on St. Peter singly and alone.

6. Universal extent of the divine commission given by Christ to Peter.

7. St. Peter the Supreme Head and Ruler.

(See ''Advent Conferences,'' by Archbishop B. Vaughan. Appendix, pp. 98–104.)

Authors Consulted in Part VI

Alzog, Rev. Dr. John, "Manual of Universal Church History," 3 vols., vol. II, p. 845 (Robert Clarke, Cincinnati).

Allies, W. Thomas, M.A., "The Chair of Peter, or the Papacy" (Burns and Oates, London).

Allnatt, C. F. B., "Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome?" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Brownson, Orestes, Works, vol. VIII, "The Protestant Rule of Faith" (Thorndike Nourse, Detroit).

Capel, Monsignor, Editor of "Faith of Catholics," 3 vols., vol. II, pp. 1-108. " 'Catholic' an Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the Catholic Church" (Pustet, New York).

Darras, Abbé J. E., "A General History of the Catholic Church," 4 vols., vol. III, p. 528 (P. O'Shea, New York).

D'Alès, Rev. A., "Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique," Article *Papauté* (The Papacy) (Beauchesne, Paris).

De Maistre, Count Joseph, "The Pope" (C. Dolman, London).

Drane, Theodosia Augusta (Mother Francis Raphael, O.S.D.), "The History of St. Catherine of Siena," 2 vols. "The Western Schism," vol. II, p. 141 (Burns and Oates, London).

England, Bishop John, Works, 5 vols. vol. I, p. 326; vol. II, p. 77 (Murphy, Baltimore).

Faà, Rev. Joseph, "Catholic Belief." "St. Peter in Rome" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Fouard, Rev. Constant, "St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity" (Longmans, Green, New York).

Gagarin, Rev. Ivan, S.J., (Russian), "The Roman Church" (Burns and Oates, London).

Guggenberger, Rev. A., "A General History of the Christian Era," 2 vols., vol. II, p. 109. "The Western Schism" (Herder, St. Louis).

Hall, Herbert E., M.A., "The Shadow of Peter," pp. 6 and 87 (Burns and Oates, London).

Janssen, John, "Germany and the Reformation" (Herder, St. Louis).

Kenrick, Most Rev. Archbishop, "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated" (Murphy, Baltimore).

Lindsay, "Evidence for the Papacy." One of the very best works on this subject: quoted by the late Archbishop Bede Vaughan in his "Advent Conferences" held at Sydney, Australia.

Livius, Rev. F. E., C.SS.R., "St. Peter, Bishop of Rome." An exhaustive treatment in a volume of 560 pages (Burns and Oates, London).

Mallock, W. H., "Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption. Position of the Church of England" (Adam and C. Black, London).

Mazzella, Cardinal Camillo, "De Ecclesia" (Pustet, Rome).

Murphy, Count John Nicholas, "The Chair of Peter" (Burns and Oates, London).

Marshall, T. W. M., "Christian Missions. Their Agents and Their Results," 2 vols. (Sadlier, Montreal, Canada.)

Murray, Rev. Patrick, "De Ecclesia Christi," 3 vols. The best theological work on this subject. Vol. I, p. 111, and vol. III, p. 813 (Gill, Dublin).

O'Reilly, Rev. Edmund, S.J., "The Relations of the Church to Society." "Schism of the West—Council of Constance," p. 279 (J. Hodges, London).

Pastor, Ludwig, "History of the Popes," 12 vols. "Schism of the West," vol. II, p. 164 (Herder, St. Louis).

Preuss, Arthur, "Fortnightly Review," Feb. 20, 1902. "Was St. Peter in Rome?" (5851 Etzel Avenue, St. Louis).

Parsons, Rev. Reuben, D.D., "Studies in Church History," 6 vols., vol. I, "Roman Pontificate of St. Peter" (Pustet, New York).

Palmer, William, "Notes on a Visit to the Russian Church." Arranged by Cardinal Newman. (Kegan Paul, Trench, London.)

Rhodes, "The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church," 2 vols., vol. II, p. 325 (Longmans, Green, New York).

Stang, Rev. Williams, "The Life of Luther" (Pustet, New York).

Schleuter, Rev. John, S.J., "The Holiness of the Church in the 19th Century" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Thébaud, Rev. Augustus, S.J., "The Church and the Moral World. Holiness of the Church" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Weninger, Rev. F. X., S.J., "Catholicity, Protestantism, and Infidelity" (Benziger Bros., New York).

PART VII

OF SOME PREROGATIVES CONFERRED BY JESUS CHRIST UPON HIS CHURCH

95. That the Church might be enabled efficaciously to pursue her mission of saving souls until the end of time, her wise and all-powerful Founder was bound to endow her with certain privileges or prerogatives indispensable for such a purpose. We shall especially treat of the gifts of indefectibility, authority and infallibility bestowed by Christ upon His Church.

CHAPTER I

THE INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

Idea or Definition of Indefectibility. Considered in the fullest extent of its meaning the indefectibility of the Church is a property which consists in the permanence which Jesus Christ assured to her until the end of the world, with the maintenance of her interior constitution and exterior form, and the preservation of all her prerogatives. The Church may, indeed, permit, during the course of centuries, *disciplinary* changes required according to circumstances for the welfare of souls, but she will never be deprived of any of her constituent elements, her members, her chiefs, her organization, nor of any of her essential properties, Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, etc., nor of her divine prerogatives, such as authority, infallibility, etc.

Let us remark, however, that this promise of indefectibility has been made to the Church *Universal* and not to any of her parts or particular Churches. These may decay or disappear:

but despite their shipwreck the true Church of Christ will ever remain indefectible, and ever Catholic also; the losses suffered will be duly compensated by new conquests and the foundation of new Churches. (n. 45.)

THESIS.—Jesus Christ in founding His Church intended that she should last, without any essential change, until the end of time.

96. First Argument. A great number of texts of the *Old Testament* clearly foretell this perpetuity of the reign of Jesus Christ. We here confine ourselves to citing these words of Daniel (2, 44): *"The God of Heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, and His kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people; and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms; and itself shall stand forever."* In place of the Synagogue, which was to change form and be essentially perfected, we find the kingdom of the Messias, the new alliance, the Christian Church destined to live forever and remain always the same. This is the argument to which St. Paul frequently recurs, in particular in his epistle to the Hebrews.

97. Second Argument. *The New Testament* is no less explicit. Sole mediator between God and man until the end of time, Jesus Christ confided to His Church the means of salvation, the fruit of His Redemption. Now this is what, with His supreme authority, He declared to Peter in making him the supreme Head of the Church: *"And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* (Matt. 16, 18.)

This was indeed to declare the indefectibility of His Church. Moreover, the mission confided to the Church is to save souls and until the consummation of ages, the time appointed by the Lord, there will always be souls to lead to heaven. Hence, the Savior, in commanding His Apostles to go over the whole earth teaching and baptizing, promised that He would be with them until the end of time. (Matt. 28, 20.)

98. Third Argument, taken from theological reason. If the Church could fail at any time, she would lose, by that fact alone and forever, all effective authority. Would not then every rebel have the right to boast that the Church had failed in her mission, that she was corrupt, and that therefore she no longer deserved belief or obedience? And is not this the very pretext set up by the innovators of the XVIth century in their attempt to justify their revolt?

99. We deem it advisable to supplement the preceding statements on the indefectibility of the Roman Catholic Church by the following concluding remarks. The hopes of mankind rest on the sublime mission she has received from her divine Founder. Sprung from on high, the connecting link between earth and heaven, between time and eternity, the sole inheritor of undying promises, she never ceases to assert the great law which lies at the root of all true civilization—the supremacy of mind over matter, of the spiritual over the temporal, in a word, of truth over error, for truth alone can stand out to its possessors with the fixed stability of a mountain range whose broad basis rests upon the solid earth, and whose summit pierces the lofty firmament above. Such is the Catholic Church; like an immovable rock in the midst of the stormy deep, she survives every tempest, and braves every conflict. Truly, it is the Church's lot to be buffeted by the world; it is her glorious destiny to suffer with her Master; she would not be the spouse of the thorn-crowned King, were she not to drink liberally of His chalice, and one of the most striking marks of her divine origin would have been wanting in her, were she sustained by the sunshine and flattery of the world. She is the only institution that has preserved her life, her vigor and her autonomy unimpaired for the last 1900 years. Kingdoms, empires, republics are swept away by the irresistible current of time, and yet Catholicity remains, a standing monument of enduring firmness, whose equal the world has never seen. Here, indeed, the principle of the so-called Darwinian theory of evolution is found for once to be true, for we have in the history of the Catholic Church the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. Of the Old Guard of the first Napo-

leon it was said that they *died,* but never surrendered. Of the Catholic Church we can truly say that she neither *dies,* nor *surrenders.* When the tyrant is gone to the dust, and the proud voices that predicted her downfall are hushed and forgotten, she lives to teach and save the nations—she lives, and shall live, leaning on the almighty power of Him that built her. She shall persevere in her stability through the ages till eternity shall strike the passing knell of all human things, for she is the house built by the wise man, nay by Incarnate Wisdom itself "*upon a rock. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.*" (Matt. 7, 24–25.)

Objection against the Indefectibility of the Church of Christ. Jewish Rabbis and Rationalists declare that the Divine promises made to the Christian Church are not more certain, more clear and absolute than those made to the Jewish Church. Now it is plain that the latter was not indefectible, for it failed: therefore neither the former can be said to possess the divine assurance of indefectibility. Thus argue also many Protestant writers.

Answer. In the first place, the Scriptural texts that apparently seem to promise indefectibility to the Synagogue, the Jewish Church, are explained and understood by other clearer testimonies foretelling the fact that the Mosaic dispensation and ceremonial Law was to be replaced by the New Law of grace and the Church to be established by the promised Messias, Jesus Christ. In the divine plan the Old Law and worship was to be temporary, not permanent: it was the shadow and figure of things to come, destined to give place to the substance and reality of the religion and Church of Christ. See Part III, ch. 1, n. 136, where the three phases of revealed religion are described. Moreover, all Catholic biblical scholars are agreed on this point that the testimonies, particularly of the prophet Isaias, regarding the glory, stability and triumph of the Church, cannot be understood or said to be verified except by applying them to the future existence, splendor, glory and stability of the Church of

Christ. Such also must be the rational obvious meaning of the prediction of the Archangel Gabriel when announcing the sublime privilege of the divine maternity to the Virgin Mary. *"Thou shalt call His name Jesus . . . and the Lord shall give unto Him the throne of David, His Father; and He shall reign in the house of Jacob forever and of His kingdom there shall be no end."* (Luke 1, 32, 33.)

Moreover, whilst explicit promises predict to the Church of Christ a perpetual, permanent stability proper of the house built by the wise man, by Incarnate Wisdom on the rock, proof against the rain that fell, and the floods that came, and the winds that blew and dashed upon that house, not a single text can be alleged from Genesis to the Apocalypse limiting the extent and significance of the sublime, peremptory promise made by Christ Himself when He said of His Church: *"And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* (Matt. 16, 18.)

CHAPTER II

AUTHORITY OR POWERS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

100. Founded in order to continue until the end of the world the work of redemption, the Church should consequently have received the authority necessary for the perfect fulfillment of her mission. According to the teaching of theology, a threefold power was granted to her for that purpose; the first concerns Faith; the second regards the administration of the Sacraments and worship; and the third has reference to the government, properly so-called, of Christian society. Though, when speaking of unity of doctrine and unity of government in the Church, and in proving the primacy of St. Peter, we have already demonstrated the existence of the three powers, it will not be without profit to briefly group together the principles relating to these subjects.

Christ then gave to His Church the triple office of teacher, priest, and pastor, comprised in the twofold power of Orders and jurisdiction.

By power we here understand not only a passive right, but also an authority which men are bound to respect and obey. Thus the Apostles received the authority as well as the right to preach the Gospel without let or hindrance; and, consequently, those to whom they preached were bound to accept their teaching.

The charge intrusted by Christ to His Church comprises the threefold office and threefold power of *teacher, priest,* and *pastor,* also reckoned under the titles of Prophet or Preacher, Priest and King. In virtue of the first the Church communicates the truths of revelation; in virtue of the second she administers the means of grace; in virtue of the third she efficaciously directs the Faithful to their last end.

Christ conferred on His Apostles the *priestly office* when He said to them at the last supper: "*Do this for a commemoration of me.*" (Luke 22, 19.) The words, "*As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained*" (John 20, 21–23), refer likewise to the priestly office. The *pastoral office* in its most comprehensive sense was contained in the words addressed to St. Peter: "*Feed my lambs; feed my sheep.*" (John 21; cf. Matt. 16, 19.) Christ, moreover, gives His Apostles the charge "*to preach the Gospel to every creature*"; whence the obligation for all to accept it: "*He that believeth not, shall be condemned.*" (Mark 16, 15, 16.) In this charge is, therefore, contained the *teaching office,* i.e., the right to teach with authority.

The power thus indicated in the Gospel *was exercised* by the Church from the earliest times. The Apostles discharged the *teaching office* by preaching the Gospel, and demanding its acceptance in the name of God. They exercised the *priestly office* as often as they acted as "*the dispensers of the mysteries of God*" (I Cor. 4, 1), ordaining priests and Bishops (Acts 14, 22), celebrating the sacred functions of the Church (I Cor. 10, 16–21.) They exercised the *pastoral office* as often as they issued laws or precepts (Acts 15, 22), or excluded criminals from the Church's communion. (I Cor. 5, 5; I Tim. 1, 20.)

Doubtless the Apostles, who with the assistance of Christ and the light of the Holy Ghost propagated the Church, must have known the extent of the authority committed to them. We must, therefore, conclude that the authority exercised by them as rulers of the Church was actually given them by Christ, to be transmitted to their successors to the end of time. (See "Handbook of the Christian Religion," by Rev. W. Wilmers, S.J., chap. II.)

Remark. In treating of the Apostolicity of the Church (n. 46), we have spoken only of two powers with which the Heads of the Church are invested; the power of Order and the power of jurisdiction. We were then considering these powers from the point of view of the *source* from which they emanated. Here we speak of the three special powers treating of them from the particular point of view of their special object or purpose.

§ I. Power to Teach

101. The Church has received from her divine Founder the power to teach or doctrinal authority, that is the right and the duty to preach the dogmatic and moral doctrine of Jesus Christ and to impose upon all men the obligation to accept this doctrine. That this is so is an undeniable fact. We shall content ourselves with indicating or rather simply recalling a few arguments.

102. First Argument. As the doctrine of Jesus Christ can only be known through the ministry of *teaching,* the Church, in receiving the mission to make that *doctrine* known everywhere, *must also have received the power* to teach all men.

As the Apostle St. Paul writes (Rom. 10, 13, 14, 15, 17) "*For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved. How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? Or, how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? And how can they preach unless they be sent? . . . Faith then cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ.*"

103. Second Argument. These words of Jesus Christ are well known: *"All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; going, therefore, teach ye all nations."* (Matt. 28, 18–19.) *"He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."* (Luke 10, 16.)

104. Third Argument. Firmly relying upon these words of their Master, the Apostles, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, gave themselves up to the ministry of preaching. *"But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord co-operating with them and confirming the word with signs that followed."* (Mark 16, 20.) To those who wished to forbid their preaching, they opposed the celebrated words which have become the watchword of every true Christian when confronted by tyrannical power: *"We ought to obey God, rather than man"*; and again: *"For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."* (Acts 5, 29; 4, 20.)

105. Remarks. 1. The method of teaching used by the Church is twofold. *Ordinary* teaching is that which is given every day by the Bishops, or by their delegates and under their supervision, the priests, by preaching, catechism, courses in theology, etc. *Extraordinary* teaching is that given by the Pope or Councils, when they proclaim a dogma or condemn an error. Extraordinary teaching is not at all necessary in order that a dogma should become obligatory as a matter of Faith. If that were required, the dogma of the Holy Eucharist, for instance, would not have been obligatory before the eleventh century (1078), and, in our own days, the dogma of the visibility of the Church, that of her indefectibility, etc., would be left open to belief or denial, because they have never been solemnly defined. The Church can no more err in her ordinary, universal and constant teaching than in her dogmatic definitions; the promises made by Jesus Christ suffer no exception. To be a heretic therefore, it is enough to knowingly deny a doctrine set forth by the ordinary and uniform teaching of the whole Church.

2. From this mission and from this power ensues the duty

for the Church to maintain the purity of the Faith, to warn the Faithful against erroneous, impious or immoral doctrines; to forbid the reading of books and newspapers which might corrupt faith or morals.

In this connection we deem it proper to treat here briefly of the Index of forbidden books issued in Rome by the authority of the Church. This is an official catalogue of books condemned by the Congregation of the Index. The late Pontiff Leo XIII revised and recast the whole legislation of the Church on this subject by his Apostolic Constitution of January 25, 1897. In it he declared that the Index is binding on all Catholics regardless of nationality, education, learning or station in life. It is hardly necessary to state that the laws forbidding books do not affect Cardinals, Bishops and the major Superiors of exempt clerical orders. (Canon 1401.) The new edition, besides giving a list of prohibited books, contains two Pontifical Constitutions, in which are classified the several kinds of books and are laid down the rules regarding the reasons for their prohibition. By the application of these rules the Faithful are able to decide for themselves the literature that falls under the ban of the Church.

However, as the official documents here referred to may not be accessible to many, all loyal Catholics will, in doubtful cases, apply to their ecclesiastical superiors for safe guidance in a matter of such vital importance. In regard to this subject wrong notions are current, which must be rectified. One of these is the opinion, entertained by not a few, that the Index contains all the books forbidden by the Church, and that consequently there are no others which we are bound to avoid. This is far from the truth. Besides the practical impossibility of such an undertaking, it is not the intention of the Roman authorities to catalogue all the literary poison that is being vomited forth by printing presses all over the world. By the application of the general laws and rules, above referred to, we can easily decide these questions and know what is our duty.

That the Church has the right to legislate on the publication and use of all books that touch on questions of Faith and

morals must be evident to everyone that has a correct concept of the Church, a point abundantly proved in this Part VII of our course. The "International Encyclopedia," vol. XII, p. 53, states: "A natural consequence of the claims of the Church to authority is the right and duty of watching over the faith of its members, of safeguarding it against every danger of corruption from books believed to be injurious to faith and morality." As history tells us, even civil rulers have at times adopted the policy of proscribing books, and they practised it in an arbitrary and despotic way, a striking contrast with the prudent and moderate legislation of Rome. All the Protestant denominations, if we except Unitarians and Universalists, publish ordinances to prevent their respective members from reading literature deemed objectionable to their peculiar tenets. The Methodists, for instance, claim the right for their leaders to determine the class of books forbidden to their flock. And yet, in a number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, the editor makes a bitter attack on the literary policy of the Church of Rome and her Expurgatory Index as a standing evidence of her despotism hostile alike to religion and literature. In view of the fact that each Protestant denomination has its own Expurgatory Index, the outcry of some of their preachers against the Catholic Church is rank hypocrisy. Yes, it is true that the Roman Church publishes the Index for guidance to her subjects throughout the world, because being consistent she does not profess one thing and do another, as some leaders of our separated brethren sometimes do.

The whole present Church legislation on the censorship of books is contained and summed up in the recent Code of Canon Law from Canon 1384 to Canon 1405.

References:

1. "Catholic Encyclopedia," vol. III.

2. "Handbook of Moral Theology," by Rev. A. Koch, vol. IV, p. 407. Adapted and edited by Arthur Preuss of *The Fortnightly Review*. Herder Book Co.

3. "The Roman Index of Forbidden Books," by Francis S. Betten, S.J. Herder Book Co.

Hence also follows the obligation to supervise the *dogmatic and moral* teaching given in society by all classes of teachers, either private or official, that is appointed by the State. No one will contest this, if the question concerns a *Christian society*. But even, if the constitution be based upon the freedom of worship, the State, if it truly respects liberty, cannot refuse to the Church this supervision, which forms an integral part of the Catholic apostolate. The State should, moreover, at least for those who profess Catholicism, come to an understanding with the ecclesiastical authorities, in order that they may exercise an efficacious control over the teaching of *human knowledge*, generally devolving upon the laity. Because, *if this be not done*, the liberty and authority of the Church would become illusory, as official professors and teachers might with perfect impunity on questions of the sciences, of history, literature, etc., contradict, attack and neutralize the lessons of the Church, her dogma and her morality. Finally, with far greater reason, the Church has a right to severely condemn anti-religious, atheistic or so-called *neutral* teaching, even when organized under the patronage of the State. In such a case the Church, to preserve her children from error and deception, must use all the resources, all the spiritual weapons of which she can dispose.

These reflections suffice to explain and to justify the stand *taken by* the Church toward civil Governments, when they pass laws sanctioning teachings opposed to some revealed doctrine, of which she has been appointed guardian, interpreter and preserver.

§ II. Power of Dispensing the Sacraments

106. The second power which the Church received from Jesus Christ, is that of determining everything that relates to the administration of the Sacraments, the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, and, in general, public worship.

First Argument. How could the Church fulfill her mission of saving souls, if, whilst she enlightens the mind with the light of revelation, she could not confer the spiritual *strength*

indispensable to enable the Faithful to observe the precepts enjoined by divine revelation? Now, it is principally by the Sacraments, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and the practice of religious worship, that the Faithful obtain the graces necessary to nourish spiritual life. The Church, therefore, should possess these means of grace in order to fulfill her mission, the sanctification of souls.

Second Argument. Moreover, the *will of the Savior* is quite explicit in this regard. Thus at the time He gave to His Apostles the command to teach, He imposed upon them the obligation to baptize all men; on another occasion He granted them the power to forgive sin; at the Last Supper, after having distributed to them His Flesh and His Blood, He commanded them to do the same thing in commemoration of Him.

Third Argument. The Apostles themselves bore witness to the existence of this power in the Church by the fact that they exercised it, and explicitly by their own words. Hence we see them baptize, confirm, ordain, celebrate the Holy Sacrifice, administer to the sick, etc.; and St. Paul writes: *"Let a man so account of us as the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God."* (I Cor. 4, 1.)

§ III. Power to Govern

107. The right conferred upon the Church to govern herself includes three other rights, analogous to those possessed by civil society; *legislative* power, or the right to make laws obligatory upon all the subjects of the Church; the *judicial* power, or the authority to interpret her laws; and finally, *executive or coercive* power, that is, the right to enforce by all necessary means, especially by the use of penalties spiritual or temporal, the observance of the laws, which she imposes upon her members. The enemies of the Church in our day do not deny to her the right to teach and to administer the Sacraments; after all, they do not trouble themselves much about these matters. But they make every effort to destroy *in her,* if they could, the power of self-government; they know that to

deprive her of this power, or simply to restrict its exercise, would be to disturb, in a serious manner, the order and well-being of the Church, to leave her without the power of repressing revolt among her members and of repelling the violent, open attacks or the secret machinations of her enemies.

If we were to believe them, the Church has no right to enact laws, to judge crime, to punish the guilty; or, if she has any right at all in this respect, it is not a right properly belonging to her, nor anything inherent in her constitution, but it is a right received by participation or communication from *the civil power,* by the benevolent concession of civil rulers, or simply an abuse arising from the neglect, the tergiversations, or the connivance of political Governments.

We shall at once give some of the proofs, which establish this important power enjoyed by the Church of Jesus Christ.

First Argument. *A society* cannot exist and attain its end without the power of governing itself. A multitude of persons desirous of attaining a certain end necessarily requires a common and effective direction. Hence, from the moment that it pleased the God-man to unite in a perfect society all who believed in Him, He was bound to provide that society with the authority necessary for the accomplishment of its mission. In other words, He was bound to appoint leaders invested with the triple power, legislative, judicial and executive; for a society always implies law, and law implies the right to judge its guilty transgressor and the right to impose penalties proportionate to the crime.

Second Argument. This is deduced from the words already cited from *Scripture* and in particular from those that were specially addressed to Peter. (See nn. 84, 90.)

Third Argument. Taken from the *conduct of the Apostles* and from the history of the Church in the earliest ages of her existence. From the very beginning the Apostles used all the powers entrusted to them, such as making laws, pronouncing judgments, and smiting with anathema the guilty, and all this was done without consulting the civil power, and even in spite of its opposition. (See Acts 15, 28; I Tim. 1, 20; I Cor. 7, 12–13; 5, 3, 4, 5; 4, 21; 11, 2; I Thess. 4, 2.) In

the following centuries the Church continued to act as her first rulers had done, by virtue of the authority which belonged to her as of right, and the belief in the governing authority of the lawful Heads of the Church never varied among the loyal members.

The triple office of the Church as King to rule, as Prophet to teach and as Priest to sanctify by applying to the souls of the Faithful the merits of Christ, through the Sacraments, is clearly pointed out in the testimonies of the Gospel. The Church, God's Kingdom upon earth, as a King is to rule her subjects by the authority communicated by Christ to His Apostles, and to their legitimate successors, Popes, Bishops and priests. *"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."* (John 20, 21.)

The Church as a Prophet that is teacher, preacher, has been authorized to teach men the way of eternal salvation, when Christ, her founder, thus spoke to His Apostles, the first teaching members: *"Go ye and teach the whole world."* (Matt. 28, 19.) *"I have appointed you, that you should go and bring forth fruit, and your fruit should remain."* (John 15, 16.)

The Church in her priestly office has been charged to purify and sanctify her members through sacramental grace, particularly by cleaning them from sin, and fitting them to partake of the divine food of life eternal. *"Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained."* (John 20, 23.) *"Take ye and eat, this is my body: drink you all of this, for this is my blood."* (Matt. 26, 26, 27, 28.) *"Do this for a commemoration of me."* (Luke 22, 19.)

The Church is not satisfied with attending to the spiritual welfare of her own flock, but, recalling the Savior's words, *"And other sheep I have that are not of this fold, them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd"* (John 10, 16.), she spares no effort in behalf of the sheep that do not belong to the fold of the good shepherd, Jesus Christ. Referring to those who, through their own fault, carelessness, and total indifference remain out of Christ's fold, use no effort whatever to ascertain

the claims of the Catholic Church, she reminds them of the words of St. Augustine directed to the heretics of his time: "Everything is possible for him who is out of the Catholic Church, except salvation. He can possess the Gospel, can have and preach faith, yet nowhere but in the Catholic Church can he find salvation." (Serm. ad pleb. Eccl. Cæsarien., n. 6, A.D. 400.)

A fuller discussion of this subject is found in Part VIII, ch. 2, where, among other important points, it is shown that they who earnestly seek for truth, ready to own and renounce their error as soon as discovered, are by no means to be numbered among wilful heretics. According to St. Augustine, followed by all Catholic theologians, such persons are *material*, not *formal* heretics. If to their honest inquiries they add the power of confident prayer, they will sooner or later come to the knowledge of saving truth and receive the grace of conversion from Him *"Who is the true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world"* (John 1, 9), for, as St. Paul assures us, *"God, our Savior, will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth."* (I Tim. 2, 3, 4.) While appealing to her separated brethren and exhorting them to enter her fold the Catholic Church does not fail to exhibit to men the proof of her divine institution, and of the heavenly authority of her mission. No ambassador ever presented credentials from his sovereign at a foreign Court, which can compare with those received by the Church from the hands of her Founder Jesus Christ: hence the reason why they successfully appeal to all men of good will. (Part V, ch. i.)

Let all converts present and future be convinced of this truth that neither Christ nor His Church stands in need of any human being, however exalted his worldly position may be: and they are very wide of the mark who sometimes say: "What a fortunate gain for the Catholic Church that such a prominent individual has joined her ranks!"

The fortunate gain is all for the convert himself. This will be very clear at the Day of Judgment, provided such a one perseveres.

CHAPTER III

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

§ I. Its Nature and Necessity

108. Nature of Infallibility. To be infallible is, in general, to have the privilege of not falling into error or of not leading others into error in teaching; for the Church it means the privilege of being preserved from all danger of changing the doctrine of Jesus Christ, or of mistaking the true meaning of what the divine Savior has taught, commanded or forbidden. Undoubtedly, God alone is infallible *by nature;* but He can, by a particular act of His providence, ensure against errors those whom He appoints to teach in His name, so that in their teaching they may never swerve in any way from the truth. What He could do, we shall prove that He has done in reality. We shall even go further; we shall show at the very outset that this privilege *should have been granted to the Church.* In making this statement we have in view *the present ordinary course* of things, for in another order of providence God *might have* used other means; for instance, He might have sent Prophets, as He did under the Old Law.

One of the very best treatments of the paramount subject of this chapter is the work by the Rev. Daniel Lyons entitled "Christianity and Infallibility—Both or Neither."

In Chapter 11 Fr. Lyons answers the question: Why do Catholics believe in the dogma of Infallibility? An answer that thoroughly sums up the arguments generally adduced by Catholic writers to prove that truth defined as a dogma of Faith by the Vatican Council (A.D. 1870), "To give directness and the force of personal conviction to my argument I will answer the above question by stating the reasons why I, a Catholic, believe in Infallibility.

"I believe in Infallibility, then, for the following, to me, very good reasons:

"I. Because I believe in the importance and necessity of

my soul's salvation; and both call for the guidance and security of Infallibility.

"II. Because I believe in the Goodness of God and in His Love for man; and this belief justly leads me to expect from Him the concession of Infallibility.

"III. Because I believe that God made a supernatural Revelation of His will for the benefit of man to the end of time; and from this fact I conclude that the Wisdom of God must have provided a living, Infallible Witness, Guardian and Interpreter to authenticate, protect, and teach in all ages the Revelation in its purity and integrity.

"IV. Because I believe, moreover, that God imposed this Revelation on the belief and practice of man as a law of faith and conduct; and from the existence of this divine obligation I conclude that God, in His Justice, must have appointed an Infallible Witness to its contents, and an Infallible Interpreter of its meaning.

"V. Because I believe that God made divine faith in the teaching of this Revelation a condition of my salvation; and such faith in its plenitude is impossible without the aid of Infallibility.

"VI. Because assuming a divine faith in the contents of Revelation to be necessary, nothing short of the certainty and security of Infallibility can satisfy the legitimate demands of my reason and conscience.

"VII. Because a living, Infallible Authority is at once the source of the greatest blessings, and a safeguard against the greatest evils.

"VIII. Because only a living, Infallible Authority can satisfactorily settle the Christian controversy, and be equal to the many and grave difficulties connected with it. Only a living, Infallible Authority can adjust and harmonize the respective claims of Reason and Revelation, Science and Faith, Liberty and Authority, Nature and Grace; in one word, of the Natural and Supernatural.

"IX. Because the doctrine is a teaching of Revelation, and is and ever has been the belief of the great majority of Christians.

"X. Because the history of the dogmatic teaching of the Church for nineteen hundred years points to Infallibility in fact.

"XI. Because without Infallibility, logically speaking, I would have no valid reason—no sufficient grounds for the profession, I will not say of Catholicism, but of Christianity. In short, to me the only consistent and tenable position is Christianity and Infallibility—both or neither."

The reasons here briefly summarized will be developed in the following pages.

FIRST THESIS.—The authority established to teach to men the doctrine of Jesus Christ must be infallible in its teaching.

109. First Argument, taken from the mission of Christ, and the necessity of divine faith. It may be set forth in different ways.

a. Jesus Christ has given to His Church the mission and the power to teach His doctrine and to transmit it from age to age *pure and intact*. Unless He were to intervene by continued miracles to preserve the purity of His teaching, Jesus Christ necessarily had to place the Church as a teaching body beyond all danger of error, in other words, endow her with doctrinal infallibility.

b. The Church imposes upon every man, in the name of God, a rigorous obligation to believe, with a faith excluding all doubt, that which she proposes for his belief, even mysteries most impenetrable to reason. But the Church cannot have the right to impose upon the conscience of men the obligation to believe, with a firm and immovable faith, that which she teaches, if she herself is subject to error in her teaching. Without the infallibility of the Church divine faith would be impossible, and with the disappearance of faith, the Christian religion itself, and all means of salvation, would disappear, for, as St. Paul says (Hebr. 11, 6), "*without faith it is impossible to please God.*"

c. Let us state this argument in a still more general manner. When there is question of religious truth necessary to

salvation, the reason of every man imperatively demands a teaching which is *absolutely certain.* It is not only the unlearned that feel the need of such a teaching; long research and study, and sincere effort do not exempt learned men from experiencing the same need. Hence, if there were not an infallible teacher of religion, mankind would see itself abandoned to all the chances and dangers of error; it would drift about uncertain as to that which most essentially concerns the peace and happiness of men, religious and moral truth. (Eph. 4, 14.)

d. The same conclusion follows if we apply this reasoning to the preaching of the Gospel *amongst heathen and unbelieving nations.* Without infallibility, the spread of the Gospel throughout the whole world would have been impossible, and consequently Catholicity could not have been a distinctive mark of the true Church of Christ. The Church sends missionaries everywhere, with the mission to convert the people to the true Faith. But if these authorized missionaries do not teach in the name of an infallible authority, these people would have a right to say that perhaps the doctrine preached to them has been changed in passing down to them through the centuries. Who could reasonably oblige them to place firm and full belief in a doctrine which may, after all, have been erroneous? What difference would there be between such preaching and the preaching of Protestant ministers, who disclaim infallibility and cannot consequently require faith in the name of God?

110. Second Argument. Taken from unity of doctrine or belief. We have proven that this unity is necessary. (See n. 32.) Now it is impossible that there should not arise in the Church controversies as to questions of Faith or morals. The history of heresies proves that such controversies have arisen at all periods of the Church's existence. How could these controversies be ultimately decided if there did not exist an authority to decide them in a peremptory and infallible manner? Without this infallibility, no decision would ever put an end to controversy, and unity of doctrine or belief would be an actual impossibility.

111. The following reflections will give additional strength to the author's argument, and anticipate the answer to certain difficulties against this dogma of the Catholic Church believed in all Christian ages, and solemnly defined by the Vatican Council in recent times (A.D. 1870).

All Christian believers are agreed on the fundamental historical fact that the Redeemer of the world constituted and appointed a body of teachers whom He authorized, commissioned and charged to convey the Gospel to all future generations, thus to extend and apply to all men the fruits of redemption, which was wrought for the salvation of the whole human race. (Matt. 28, 18, 19, 20.) Now this body of teachers, having been divinely commissioned to teach, must at the same time have received from God a guarantee of always being able to teach the truth; in other words, they must be infallible in their teaching, for an error in matters of religion may lead to eternal ruin. As the eminent Dr. Brownson has remarked, the divine commission to teach naturally carries with it the divine pledge of infallibility in teaching, for it is repugnant to reason and common sense to suppose that Almighty God can authorize a Church to teach without rendering her competent to teach. But a fallible Church, a Church liable to deceive or be deceived, is not competent to teach. Moreover, unless we suppose that God is indifferent as to what we believe or do in matters of religious worship, and that truth and error are equally acceptable in His sight, we must say that the command to teach implies the obligation of obedience on the part of those who are taught, for authority and submission are correlative terms; therefore all nations and individuals are bound to obey and believe the teachers that are divinely commissioned, and the penalty for disobedience is equal to the punishment to be meted out to wilful idolators and dishonest publicans, for Jesus Christ says in His Gospel: "*If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.*" (Matt. 18, 17.)

But again, it is repugnant to say that God imposes on man under the pain of sin and damnation the duty to believe a fallible teacher, one who may both deceive and be deceived;

for then we should be obliged to believe falsehood on pain of disbelieving God, and God, who is truth itself, would make belief in falsehood essential to salvation—a supposition not less impious than absurd.

Therefore, when we assert that God authorized the Church to teach, we say only in other words that He holds Himself responsible for what she teaches. He vouches for the truth of her testimony, and if she could err, mistake or misrepresent the truth, God would become responsible for error, and authorize and sanction the teachers of falsehood, which is blasphemy to suppose; for, mark well, in matters of religious faith, it is a question not of *exterior* submission only, but also of an *interior* assent. I know full well that the divine law and the principle of order compel me to submit even to an unjust sentence of a civil tribunal, if it cannot be evaded by any lawful means, even though I may be certain that the judge was deceived by perjured witnesses; but no law, whether human or divine, commands me to believe that the verdict was right and the sentence just. Whilst in point of dogmatical teaching from His commissioned messengers, God enjoins a full conviction and interior belief of the doctrines they teach. Hence, if God has founded a Church, and authorized her to teach, she must be able to teach infallibly if she is to teach at all. In this light we can appreciate the full significance of these words of Jesus Christ, addressed to His Apostles after He had commissioned them to teach: "*He that heareth you heareth me. And he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.*" (Luke 10, 16.)

Therefore the question of infallibility, which is wont to provoke so much animosity, is a very simple thing after all. It is reduced to the question of the divine commission to teach. That fact once established, immunity from error in the authorized teachers follows as a necessary consequence, which no unbiassed, reasoning mind can reject.

These two facts, then, being firmly established, viz., the fact of the divine commission and the guarantee of infallibility in executing it even to the consummation of the ages, we have next to face the paramount question which is the final test of

all religious discussions, and that is this: Where shall we look in this broad world for that body of teachers divinely commissioned to teach and to teach infallibly? The answer, though a momentous one, thank God, is not far to seek, for when it is question of identifying the ministers of God's Church authorized to teach infallibly we Catholics raise a controversy in which we have no opponent. We vindicate a privilege in which we find no rival claimants. For it is a well-known fact that all the dissenting sects, no matter how much they may conflict with one another, are unanimously agreed on this point of disclaiming infallibility in their teachers, and they make it one of their chief charges against the Catholic Church that she claims immunity from error in matters of Faith and morals. By so doing they evidently commit a suicidal act and cut the ground from under their own feet; for they thereby renounce all claim to a divine commission to preach the Gospel of Christ. For it stands to reason to say that the teachers who by their own confession are fallible, may lead to error and teach falsehood, and hence cannot be divinely commissioned, authorized and sent by God to teach men the truth. To such men are applied the words of the Lord in the twenty-third chapter of Jeremias: "*I did not send them, yet they ran; I did not speak to them, yet they prophesied.*" Hence, St. Paul writes: "*Faith cometh by hearing; how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach unless they be sent?*" (Rom. 10, 14, 17.) Therefore, all so-called ministers and teachers of the Gospel that are confessedly fallible, have not the divine assistance preserving them from error, and are, consequently, by their own admission, blind guides, and our blessed Lord said in His Gospel (Matt. 15, 8, 14) "*that if the blind lead the blind both fall into the pit.*" In this question, then, of the infallibility of the Church, the free and spontaneous concession of our adversaries dispenses us from all further proof. They themselves give in and surrender the point at the very outset and it is superfluous to endeavor to prove what is already granted. And whoever knows anything of the religious dissensions, the contradictory teachings and endless doctrinal changes, that

have taken place during the last three centuries outside of the pale of the Catholic Church, will at once understand how the prudence of the serpent induced our adversaries to disclaim all infallibility. "Truth is one," said Bossuet, addressing the heretics, "eternal and immutable, you change, therefore you err." (History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.)

112. To resume my argument in brief: There exists upon earth a body of teachers divinely commissioned; and teachers divinely commissioned must be infallible; all Christian sects disclaim infallibility, and consequently, the divine commission; therefore, the Catholic Church alone is in possession of such a gift; therefore, she alone has the right to teach; therefore, she is truly the pillar and ground of the truth. (I Tim. 3, 15.)

Catholics maintain, then, first, that in the Church of Christ there is a teaching authority divinely established; secondly, that this authority is infallible within the sphere of all matters concerning Faith and morals; thirdly, that this infallibility resides both in the whole teaching body of the Church, the Bishops presided over by the Pope, and in the Pope alone whenever he speaks ex-cathedra, that is, as the Teacher of the Universal Church, defining doctrines that are to be held by all Catholics as divinely revealed. And so long as each individual, Bishop, priest or layman, teaches and believes what is taught and believed by the Church and the chief Pastor, their doctrine and belief partake of the very infallibility of the Church herself, and of the Supreme Pontiff, the seat and center of Catholic truth. Many of our keen adversaries have felt the cogency of this reasoning; hence, all their efforts are invariably directed to this point, viz., to detect, if possible, one single error, one falsehood or contradiction in the teachings of the Catholic Church, for this would be sufficient to disprove her claim to speak in the name of God, and to brand her authority as a tyranny and her infallibility as an imposture. The enemy of the Catholic Church knows full well that if one contradiction in her doctrine, one dogmatic decision opposed to another, one definition inconsistent with reason, be

clearly and plainly established, and the castle of Rome would fall to the ground and crumble into dust. But the Almighty has spoken. *"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* (Matt. 16, 18.) And the divine assistance which has baffled until now the impotent attacks of all the enemies of the Catholic Church shall continue, even to the end of time, to foil their impious attempts. Hence, the Catholic Church, conscious as she is of her divine mission and of her immunity from error in what concerns eternal salvation, viz., in everything that falls within the sphere of moral teaching and dogmatic belief, addresses to all men the words of Jesus Christ, her Founder: *"You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."* (John 8, 32.) Free indeed, with the freedom of the children of God; for her unerring voice teaches men their eternal happy destiny and the means to attain it.

SECOND THESIS.—Jesus Christ has, as a matter of fact, really instituted in His Church an authority infallible in its dogmatic and moral teaching.

113. When Jesus Christ sent His Apostles throughout the whole world to call souls to truth and salvation, He addressed to them these words: *"All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."* (Matt. 28, 18, 19, 20.) *"As the Father hath sent me, I also, send you."* (John 20, 21.) *"Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned."* (Mark 16, 15, 16.) *"And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever, the Spirit of truth . . ."* (John 14, 16, 17.) And *"when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth."* (John 16, 13.) *"But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father, the spirit of truth, who proceedeth from*

the Father, he shall give testimony of me: And you shall give testimony, because you are with me from the beginning.'' (John 15, 26–27.) *''You are the salt of the earth. . . . You are the light of the world.''* (Matt. 5, 13–14.) *''He that heareth you, heareth me.''* (Luke 10, 16.) *''If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.''* (Matt. 18, 17.) *''I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist and gainsay.''* (Luke 21, 15.)

Hence, it is evident: Jesus Christ has established *perfect solidarity* between Himself and those whom He commanded to teach to the world the truth that saves. He promised to them, in the most solemn manner, His special assistance in the teaching which He enjoined upon them, and He affirms that this assistance will last *until the end of time.* But this assistance is assured also to their legitimate successors. At all events, it is plain that men in all future time, as in the past ages, require religious knowledge, safe from all danger of error.

We do not deem it necessary here to appeal to *Tradition.* Moreover, Protestants, our opponents in the present question, are forced to yield to inevitable evidence, and to acknowledge that from the Vth to the XVIth century, the Fathers and theologians have always professed the Catholic dogma of infallibility. We draw therefrom the conclusion that such was also the doctrine of the first four centuries; for such an important change could not have been effected without arousing a formidable opposition, either on the part of the Bishops and the Faithful, or more particularly on the part of heretics.

Moreover, the whole history of the Church, the respect always entertained for the decisions of the first four ecumenical Councils, as well as for the subsequent ones, show sufficiently what has been, at all times, the tradition of the Church on this doctrinal point.

We shall soon prove that this privilege bestowed on the Church was personally granted to her Supreme Head, the Roman Pontiff.

§ II. Object of Infallibility or Matters on Which It Is Exercised

114. The doctrinal authority of the Church is not unlimited; it is, on the contrary, confined within the very precise limits of revelation coming from God; it bears only on the deposit of revealed doctrine and on what is necessary for the preservation of this deposit. By these limits the extent of infallibility is measured.

Its object then comprises: 1. The teaching of the dogmas or truths of Faith that are to be believed.

2. The teaching of morality or of the moral truths and principles to be reduced to practice.

3. Matters of general discipline only in so far as they touch upon Faith or morals.

4. Dogmatic facts, that is to say, facts so closely connected with dogma, that they cannot be called in question without undermining dogma itself. These are, for instance, the declarations and statements of errors contained in writings upon which the Church passes judgment, as without this certainty the Church could not, as in duty bound, preserve from the poison of error the flock confided to her care.

Hence, when we speak of the extent of the inerrancy of the Church, we must bear in mind the following proposition, viz., "It is no article of Catholic Faith that the Church cannot err, either in matters of fact not relating to Faith, or in matters of changeable discipline concerning things alterable by the circumstances of time and place, and, therefore, not connected with either Faith or morals; or in matters of speculation, or civil policy, depending on mere human judgment, or testimony. These things are not *revelations deposited in the Church*, in regard *to which alone* she has the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit. (See "Faith of Catholics," vol. I, p. 468.)

115. Remarks. 1. Infallibility does not come from a divine inspiration, properly so-called, nor from a new revelation, but from a special heavenly assistance, imparted either to the Bishops united with the Pope, or to the Supreme Pastor,

enabling them to understand and expound the revelations made by Jesus Christ. This assistance is far from rendering researches, discussions, human labor and study useless. It is only after having made use of every means that would preclude the danger of acting with temerity; it is only after having studied with the greatest care the two sources of revelation, the Scripture and Tradition, that the Church or the Pope declares as revealed a truth implicitly contained up to that time in the deposit of revelation.

Again, though infallible, the Pope is not inspired; far from it. "No Pope," writes Cardinal Hergenröther (Anti-Janus, p. 73), "has ever attributed to himself *inspiration,* but divine assistance only."

According to Catholic theology, the gift of inspiration implies four things: (1) *A divine illumination* of the mind of the teacher, by which the truth to be taught and recorded is directly and immediately communicated to him; (2) *a divine impulse* to his will, which directly and efficaciously (without, however, destroying his liberty) determines him to write or speak; (3) *a divine direction,* to insure that the inspired agent faithfully teaches *all* that and *only* that which God wishes him to teach by writing, or word of mouth; and (4) *a divine assistance* to the end that the truths supernaturally conceived are correctly expressed. Infallibility, on the other hand, merely implies *a divine assistance,* which guarantees to the Pope immunity from all liability to err, when officially teaching the Universal Church as her Supreme Pastor. Infallibility, then, agrees with inspiration in the fourth point only; in the other three it altogether differs from it. Hence, it is that though there can be no prophetic inspiration without infallibility, yet there can be papal infallibility without inspiration.

2. Infallibility differs essentially from *impeccability,* which consists in not being capable of sinning; this signal privilege, granted to the Most Holy Virgin Mary, has never been considered as having been attributed to the Sovereign Pontiff.

Infallibility means exemption from liability to err; it does

not mean merely freedom from actual error, but it, moreover, implies freedom from the *possibility* of erring. Infallibility is not to be confounded with impeccability; the former excludes the possibility of error in the *interpretation* of revealed Faith and moral law; the latter excludes the possibility of sin in the *observance* of the law. Neither is infallibility a quality inherent in any person, but is an *assistance* attached to an office, and its function is not the discovery of new religious truths, but the interpretation, the expounding and the guardianship of old ones.

The Vatican Council decrees that the definitions of the Pope, in which, by virtue of his office as Pastor and Doctor, he lays down a certain doctrine on Faith or morals to be held *de fide* by all his subjects, are *per se* irreversible, that is of their own nature, and not only when they receive the subsequent assent of the Church. Hence all the laws which are issued from time to time by the Pope in matters of discipline, and therefore alterable, are not included in the definitions of the Vatican Council as articles of Faith. On this account it is quite lawful for Bishops to apply to the Holy See for alterations or exceptions demanded by some peculiar conditions of their dioceses.

In connection with the obligation of both external and interior assent to Pontifical definitions ex-cathedra, it has been asked whether such definitions can be likened to the Holy Gospel.

It is answered that it would be a downright absurdity to compare a papal utterance with the Gospel. No theologian has ever approved such erroneous view. The Gospel is the *inspired* Word of God: but the infallible utterances of the Supreme Pontiff are not derived from the *inspiration*, but are the unerring result of a special assistance of the Holy Ghost.

It is important to bear in mind that there are four distinct classes of matters, which, as belonging to the province of things ecclesiastical, fall under the supreme power of the Pope, namely, matters of Faith, of Morals, of Discipline and of Government. In the chapter referring to the infallible teaching office of the Roman Pontiff the Vatican Council treats

exclusively of the infallible authority of the Pope in matters of the first and second classes, Faith and Morals, not of matters of the third and fourth classes, Discipline and Government.

To dispel some groundless fears of civil rulers, we add the following remark. It has been asked whether the right which the Popes have exercised in the Middle Ages, of deposing Christian princes, is still possessed, and whether it has anything to do with the definition of Papal Infallibility. A very authoritative answer has been given to the above inquiry. At a meeting in Rome of the Academy of the Catholic Religion, held July 20, 1871, Pius IX, of happy memory, spoke as follows. He exhorted its members, a gathering of illustrious savants, to do their best to refute the pernicious error of those who represent the infallibility of the Pope as comprising in itself the right to dethrone sovereigns and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance. This right, Pius IX said, has indeed been exercised by Popes in extreme cases: but it has absolutely nothing to do with Papal Infallibility. It was the result of the *Jus Publicum*, the public right, then in force by the consent of Christian nations, who recognized in the person of the Pope the Supreme Judge of Christendom and constituted him arbiter and judge over princes and people, even in temporal matters. Nothing but bad faith could confound things so different and ages so dissimilar. In those ages of Faith the Popes, solicited by the people, exercised that right when the public weal demanded the protection and the vindication of the legitimate rights of the subjects when oppressed by unjust doings of their rulers.

The contrary view has been devised to excite civil princes against the Church.

§ III. Subject of Infallibility, or on Whom It Resides

I. Infallibility of the Teaching Church

116. To say that the Church is infallible in her teaching is equivalent to saying that the body of pastors, united to the Pope, the Supreme Head of the Church, is infallible, whether

they be assembled in the solemn sittings of an Ecumenical Council, or remain dispersed throughout the world.

Let us remark, moreover, that to be ecumenical or general, a Council must have been convoked or approved as such by the Pope, to whom belongs the right to preside over it, either personally or by his delegates. If a Council had been convoked by the Pope or with his approbation, and if subsequently the Head of the Church should separate himself from it, the Council would then become an assemblage without a head and could no longer do anything; should it obstinately continue its labors, it would be nothing more than a conciliabulum, viz., an illegitimate conventicle, whose decrees and definitions would be null and void.

II. Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff

117. When He speaks as Head of the Church, with the fullness of his doctrinal authority, the Sovereign Pontiff possesses, *in his person alone,* the same infallibility as the whole teaching Church, or as the whole episcopal body. This is the belief of the Church, a belief held and acted upon as certain at all times, and which was declared to be a dogma of Catholic Faith by the definition of the Vatican Council. These are the terms of that definition:

"This gift of truth and never-failing Faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that, the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell. . . .

"Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian Faith, for the glory of God our Savior, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the Sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex-cathedra,* that is, when in the discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all

Christians, by virtue of his Supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding Faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding Faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

"But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

"Given at Rome in Public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate."

This definition achieved the happy result of putting an end to the errors of Gallicanism. The Sorbonne—University of Paris—from the time of Gerson, has never been unsuspiciously favorable to the doctrine of the absolute supremacy of the Pope in the Church. Such opinions, quite extensively spread among the French clergy, were organized and formed into a politico-religious system under the reign of Louis XIV, in the year 1682.

We shall say a word about the circumstances under which such deliberations were adopted. After some controversies with the Court of Rome, Louis XIV, with the intention of humiliating the Pope, convoked a meeting of Bishops, in which, under the direction and leadership of Bossuet, there was issued a declaration, in four articles, of which the following is the last: "Though the Pope has the principal part in questions of Faith, and his decrees concern all the Churches and each of them in particular, yet his judgment is not irreformable or exempt from revision unless there should intervene the consent (explicit or tacit) of the Church herself." This article never had any doctrinal value. Only 34 prelates out of 135 signed this declaration. The others never gave it their adhesion, and even opposed it with irresistible vigor and logic. In the same year, 1682, it was condemned by the solemn

disapproval of Pope Innocent XI, who annulled all the acts of this assembly. It was again and more expressly condemned by Alexander VIII in 1690 and by Pius VI in 1794. Moreover, the Bishops who had signed the declaration openly disavowed it, and even Bossuet himself, who had drawn it up, decided not to defend it. Finally Louis XIV submitted in his turn by suspending the execution of the decree regarding some new ecclesiastical laws. However, the Gallican error did not thereby become extinct; it lifted up its head with a certain violence at the time of the Vatican Council, but this was its last agonizing effort. After the definition, all that were previously opposed to the doctrine of infallibility and those that deemed its definition inopportune, with few exceptions, accepted the decree in perfect submission, giving once more to the world the spectacle, so often renewed, of the wonderful power and indestructible unity of the Roman Catholic Church, the only true Church of Jesus Christ.

In connection with the present subject we remember this incident: On the 18th day of July, A.D. 1870, more than 60 Cardinals and 800 Archbishops and Bishops, and an immense multitude of people, representing every country of the world, were gathered in St. Peter's. While the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX, was reading the decree defining the infallibility of the Church and of her visible Head, the Vicar of Christ, a terrific storm, accompanied by thunder and lightning, was prevailing in Rome. A French Bishop, turning to a neighboring prelate, said, "This is Mount Sinai over again." "No," replied the witty prelate, "but it is the funeral of Gallicanism."—R. I. P.

We shall content ourselves with indicating a few of the many proofs, on which the doctrine of the Council is founded.

THESIS.—When the Sovereign Pontiff speaks ex-cathedra, that is, as head of the Church, in the plenitude of his doctrinal authority, he is endowed with infallibility.

119. First Argument. Taken from Sacred Scripture.

a. *"And I say to thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock*

I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. 16, 18.) It follows from these words that the Pope, one of whose *essential* functions is to teach the truths revealed by Jesus Christ, is necessarily infallible. It is on him that the Church rests as her foundation; it is from him that she draws her stability, her perpetuity. Now, the stability of a religious society depends above all *upon unity of Faith;* her perpetuity supposes exemption from all error in propounding and interpreting that Faith. How, in fact, could this constant, consistent and unbroken unity be possible, if Peter, the foundation of the spiritual edifice, could err as to the truths which he enjoins upon the belief of all the Faithful? If, by his teaching, the Pope could lead the Faithful into error, the devil, the father of lies, therefore the gates of hell, would have prevailed against the Church and against her Head.

b. "*Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.*" (John 21, 15–17.) These words, addressed to Peter alone, conferred upon him the mission to feed the lambs and the sheep, that is, the Faithful and those who are their spiritual Fathers, hence, all the members of the Church. But the nourishment or food of souls is the truth; if Peter were not infallible, if he could not discern with certainty truth from error in matters of Faith, he would infect with the poison of error the flock which is confided to him; he would lead it on the way of perdition.

120. Second Argument. Derived from Tradition. If the Scriptures are clear as to the present question, Tradition is, perhaps, still more explicit. The reader can find a great number of texts of the Holy Fathers and of Councils in "L'Infaillibilité" (Infallibility), by Card. Deschamps, in "The Faith of Catholics," vol. 2, pp. 1–108; vol. 3, pp. 451–460, and in Lindsay, "Evidence for the Papacy."

We shall simply mention this fact, which is decisive in itself, that, *at all times,* the Sovereign Pontiffs have used this their prerogative, by condemning heresies throughout the whole world, acting in this by the authority which belongs exclusively to them and without convoking a General or Ecumenical Council, and that their decisions have been accepted as infallible by the whole Church. It is St. Augustine who first

used the significant words, so often repeated since his day: *"Roma locuta est, causa finita est"* (Rome has spoken, the cause is ended.) Before him, St. Ambrose had used another expression, which is also accepted as an axiom: *"Ubi est Petrus, ibi Ecclesia"* (Where Peter is, there is the Church). (See n. 85.)

If it be asked how is it that, as to a truth so firmly established and universally admitted, Gallicanism was possible, we will answer in the first place that political motives can blind even the best minds; moreover, the Gallicans, without perceiving it, started from an hypothesis that was false and absolutely impossible. They supposed the Pope to be speaking in one sense and the whole Church being of a contrary mind on the same question, or point of doctrine. Hence, they could not understand that the decision of the Pope alone could prevail against that of the whole Church. But this is a supposition that can never be realized, because the definition of the Supreme Head of the Church cannot be other than the expression of the traditional belief of the Church herself. It is known, for instance, that when it was question of defining the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Universal Church, when consulted as to her belief, answered by the voice of all her pastors that she believed in the immunity of the Mother of God from original sin. One Bishop alone thought otherwise, but he hastened, on the proclamation of the definition to give his adhesion to the dogma.

§ IV. Conditions of Infallibility

121. We have seen, when speaking of infallibility, what is required in order that a Council may be ecumenical or general, and consequently infallible. There remains to determine *in what circumstances* the Pope is infallible, that is, *when* in his teaching he is exempt from error. For this purpose, let us examine the very terms of the decision of the Vatican Council of 1870.

According to the Holy Council, in order that the Pope be speaking *ex-cathedra*, and therefore held to be infallible in

his utterances, it is necessary: (1) that he be acting by virtue of his supreme authority and as Head of the Universal Church; (2) that he have the intention to *issue a definition*, an intention that must be deducible either from the terms which he employs, for instance, if he uses the words, *We define;* if he fulminates anathema against the contrary doctrine; or lastly, from the circumstances in which he speaks.

In a word, the Pope speaks *ex-cathedra* every time that he makes known his intention to bind the Faithful to accept what he teaches in matters of Faith or morals.

It follows from this that the opinions, the writings and the acts of the Pope as a private individual do not enjoy in any manner the privilege of infallibility. Thus the allocutions of the Sovereign Pontiff to the deputations which he receives are not acts *ex-cathedra.*

Let us add that infallibility affects only the definition itself, and not the considerations or the arguments, whether Scriptural, philosophical or historical, which generally form the preliminaries of dogmatic definitions.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY DEFENDED

Canons Liddon and Bright of the Anglican Church, in their church defense Tract No. 3, attempt to disprove the privilege of infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs. Their efforts are mainly directed to the case of Pope Honorius, whom they accuse of holding and teaching the heresy of Monothelism, according to which there is admitted in Christ only one will, the divine, the human having been entirely absorbed and annulled in the Incarnation.

As to similar charges made against Pope Liberius (A.D. 352) and Pope Vigilius (A.D. 538), the Tract writers themselves admit that they cannot be fairly urged as disproving infallibility. For Liberius, according to them, issued no definition *ex-cathedra* in the sense of the Vatican Council; and the case of Pope Vigilius, is not, properly speaking, relevant to the present question, as he also was not defining a doctrine in the sense of the Vatican decree. As to Pope Liberius, who

has been accused of subscribing an Arian formula of Faith, and of condemning St. Athanasius, it is now held by competent critics that that Pontiff's fall is entirely fictitious. Hence Bossuet, referring to this matter, speaks as follows: "I have expunged from my treatise on the Ecclesiastical Power all that regards Pope Liberius, as it could not prove the point that I intended to establish."

There remains then the case of Pope Honorius I (A.D. 625), who is said to have espoused the cause of the Monothelites, and to have been, on that account, condemned both by the sixth Ecumenical Council, held in Constantinople in the years 680–681, under Pope Agatho, and by Leo II (A.D. 682). Our answer, based on unimpeachable authorities, to be quoted hereafter, implies an emphatic denial of the charge taken from documents subject to the gravest suspicions of fraudulent interpolations. The Fathers of the Council and St. Leo did not condemn Honorius for having promulgated an erroneous definition of Faith addressed to the Universal Church, nor for having himself professed Monothelism, but simply blamed him for not having used more vigorous means for its suppression, and because, by imposing silence on the disputants, instead of checking the spread of heresy, he rather fomented it. Hence the most our opponents can show in this lamentable case, is that Pontiff's negligence in making use of his Apostolic power, under the critical circumstances in which he found himself. But this does not affect our thesis regarding the infallibility of the Head of the Church when teaching or defining a matter of Faith as held by the Church and explicitly proposed as such to all the Faithful. That Honorius did nothing to impugn this, is manifest from the very charge which is made against him, the silencing of discussion, and the refusal to define. Therefore, the Conciliary and Pontifical censures of Honorius, whatever they may have been, come to this—that they condemned him precisely for not putting an end to the discussion by the exercise of his gift of infallibility; for negligence in the performance of his Pontifical office; for too great credulity in believing the protestations and explanations of Sergius, the crafty Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, and for his

imprudent silence, whereby he permitted the Faith to be endangered through the machinations of that wily heretic.

As Father Lyons pertinently remarks in his book cited above, it must be admitted that if in the whole history of the Papacy, from the day of Pentecost to the present moment, *one solitary case* could be cited where an *ex-cathedra* act (or decision) of one Pope contradicted an *ex-cathedra* act (or decision) of another, or of a General Council (or an evident Scriptural truth), such a fact would be absolutely fatal to the dogma of infallibility. (n. 112.) But such a case does not exist and cannot be produced. The enemies of infallibility have searched history through and through; lynx-eyed they have scrutinized the acts of Popes and Councils for nineteen hundred years, but without success. Can we, independently of the special assistance of the Holy Spirit, and of the privilege of infallibility divinely conferred on the Roman Pontiffs, can we, I say, account for the wonderful harmony in the *ex-cathedra* teaching of the Popes from St. Peter to Pius XI? How then does the case stand? Out of two hundred and sixty-one Pontiffs, in the course of nineteen centuries, only a few have been impeached: and, it has been shown that the case against every one of those few, upon close and impartial examination, breaks down completely to the great discomfiture of the enemies of the Papacy.

Among the most distinguished defenders of Papal infallibility are reckoned the theologians Dominic Palmieri, S.J., and Paul Bottalla, S.J. The former in his "Tractatus de Romano Pontifice"—a treatise on the Roman Pontiff, Thesis XXXIII, refutes all the charges made by adversaries against that privilege by a thorough discussion of the following historical cases. These are the Popes ably defended by this distinguished author:

St. Liberius, 352; St. Hormisdas, 514; John II, 532; Honorius I, 625; St. Zachary, 741; Nicholas I, 858; Stephen VII, 896; Innocent III, 1198; Nicholas III, 1277; John XXII, 1316; Sixtus V, 1585; Urban VIII, 1623.

The Rev. Paul Bottalla, S.J., in his classical work, "The Pope and the Church," two volumes, treats in the second vol-

ume of the infallibility of the Pope. In fifteen chapters he vindicates with rare ability that Pontifical prerogative and confutes the Gallican theories opposed to that dogma. He also deals in an exhaustive manner with the cases of St. Liberius and Pope Honorius I.

The limited space allowed to this course prevents us from entering into a lengthy discussion of the cases mentioned above. However, we deemed it advisable to inform the readers of the fact that full justice has been done by Catholic writers to this controversial subject, as shown in the standard works quoted and in the following Catholic Encyclopedia and Dictionaries:

"Catholic Encyclopedia," fifteen volumes, Index and Supplement. The Encyclopedia Press, New York.

"Catholic Dictionary," by William A. Addis and Thomas Arnold, M.A. The Catholic Publication Society, New York.

"Ecclesiastical Dictionary," by Rev. John Thein. Benziger Brothers, New York.

CHAPTER IV

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

122. The Church has received from Jesus Christ all the powers necessary to attain her end, and all men must, in order to be saved, belong to her and obey her laws. On the other hand, man, being a social being, naturally forms part of civil society, which has also received from God the necessary powers to realize its own end and rightfully exacts obedience to its laws.

It is important to know what relations should exist, by the will of God, between these two societies composed of the same members; in other words, to know precisely the reciprocal rights and duties of the Church and of the State.

Leo XIII, in his admirable Encyclical, *Immortale Dei,* on The Christian Constitution of States (A.D. 1885), has set them forth in the clearest light. We shall cite some passages

from it; and then recapitulate this doctrine in a few words. We will in this way help to determine with precision what are the true ideas to be entertained as to this important question. This is especially necessary at the present time, when men endeavor to thwart and shackle the Church in the exercise of her authority and to subject her to the powers of the earth.

"God," says Pope Leo XIII, "has divided the government of mankind between two powers: the ecclesiastical power and the civil power; the one designed for heavenly, the other for earthly interests. Each of them is sovereign in its own sphere, each of them is confined within limits perfectly defined and traced in conformity with its nature and special purpose. There is, therefore, a circumscribed sphere within which each of them exercises its action, *jure proprio,* through its own right. However, as their authority is wielded over the same subject, it may happen that one and the same thing, though from a different cause, may be under the jurisdiction and judgment of both powers. It is, therefore, necessary that there should be between both powers a well-defined system of relations, not without analogy with the relations which in man constitute the union of the soul and of the body. We can form a correct idea of the nature and influence of these relations only by considering the character of each of these two powers, and by taking account of the excellence and nobility of their respective object or purpose, because, whilst the one has for its proximate and special end to concern itself with earthly interests, the other, on the contrary, aims at serving the eternal. Thus everything that in human affairs is sacred for any cause whatsoever, everything that refers to the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either by its intrinsic nature or on account of its end, all this evidently belongs to the authority of the Church. As to things embraced in the civil and political order, it is but just that they should be subject to civil authority, because Jesus Christ has commanded us to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

Previous to this, in his Encyclical *Diuturnum illud* (A.D. 1881), Leo XIII had said: "The Church acknowledges and

declares that everything which belongs to the civil order is under the power and supreme authority of secular rulers. In matters, the judgment of which belongs, for various reasons, both to the religious and to the civil authority, the Church desires that there should be a mutual agreement, through whose beneficent influence fatal dissensions are spared to both of them."

123. As early as the year 492, viz., 1432 years ago, the same principles were laid down by a predecessor of the reigning Pontiff. "Two powers govern the world," writes Pope Gelasius I to the Greek Emperor Anastasius; "the spiritual authority of the Roman Pontiff, and the temporal power of kings." These powers have for their end, one the spiritual happiness of man here and hereafter, the other, the temporal prosperity of society in the present world. This distinction of powers is an essentially Christian principle, in direct opposition to the Pagan axiom: "*Cuius est regio, illius est religio*" —The religion of a country is that of its ruler, a formula of abject servitude to a power to which the divine Lawgiver committed no spiritual authority; a formula of revolt against those whom Christ invested with the fullness of religious authority for the government of souls. The two powers are indeed essentially distinct; but they are, by no means, hostile. Far from it; they have reciprocal duties, the performance of which affords them a mutual support. They are like two cogwheels, producing uniform motion so long as they work harmoniously or regularly into each other. If the temporal power, as in duty bound, causes the spiritual authority to be respected, and refrains from meddling with things beyond its competence, the spiritual authority, on its side, recognizes in the temporal prince a power that comes from God, and, by imposing on its subjects both interior and exterior submission, vindicates the majesty of the law, secures the triumph of order, and the stability of thrones and States. This is the basis of the Christian organization of society, as well as the guarantee of the dignity of man. (See "The Fact Divine," by Broeckaert, S.J., p. 242.)

FIRST THESIS.—The ecclesiastical power and the civil power, Church and State, are independent or sovereign, each within the limits of its own sphere of action.

§ I. Independence of the Spiritual Power

124. First Argument. Taken from the expressed will of Jesus Christ. It was to St. Peter and to his successors that Jesus Christ confided the government of His Church. "It is to the Church and not to the State," says Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Immortale Dei* (A.D. 1885), "that belongs the right to guide men to celestial things; it is to the Church that God has given the command to take cognizance of and to decide everything that relates to religion, to teach all nations, to extend, as far as possible, the frontiers of the Christian name; in a word, to administer freely and as she sees fit, the Christian interests of the souls confided to her care." It is evident that to attempt to subject the Church to any other power than that which God has established, would be to strive to overthrow the work of God Himself.

125. Second Argument. Taken from the more exalted end or purpose of the Church. Civil society has for its direct object the securing to man of material comforts and protection, aiding him in the preservation and development of his natural faculties and resources in the civil and intellectual order. Religious society, or the Church, has for its special end to enable man to reach perfect and eternal happiness. To establish and spread the kingdom of God upon earth, to labor for the moral and supernatural perfection of man, to lead him to his supreme destiny, to secure to him the boundless happiness which consists in the eternal possession of God; all this evidently constitutes a mission immensely superior to that which belongs to civil power. "As the chief end of the Church is much more noble than all other purposes," says Leo XIII, "it naturally follows that her power excels all other powers and it can in nowise be reckoned as inferior, or subject, or subordinate to the civil power."

126. Third Argument. Deduced from the conduct of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. Nowhere do we find Jesus Christ asking of the temporal rulers leave or authorization to preach, to assemble His disciples, to establish His Church. Nowhere also does He command His Apostles to come to any agreement with civil Governments for the preaching of the Gospel and the exercise of their ministry. He foretells to them, on the contrary, that they will be persecuted and cruelly treated by rulers and magistrates because of their mission. Hence, we see that the Apostles announce everywhere the good tidings of salvation, they found churches, appoint Bishops, priests, deacons, enact disciplinary laws, obligatory on the Faithful, without ever concerning themselves in any way as to the powers of the world; if expelled from one place, they go to another; if they suffer injuries and cruel treatment, they rejoice at having suffered for the name of Christ. "*And they, indeed, went from the presence of the council rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus.*" (Acts 5, 41.) They simply say: "*We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.*" (Acts 4, 20.)

127. The Acts of the Apostles give us a striking example of this independence of the spiritual power. The Jewish magistrates forbid the Apostles to preach the doctrine of Jesus, because, they say, they thereby disturb the public peace. What is their answer? "*We ought to obey God rather than men.*" (Acts 5, 29.) Behold these two conflicting powers facing each other; on the one hand the Church, who insists on her right and duty of preaching the Gospel in order to realize her end, the salvation of souls, a matter of strictly spiritual interest; and on the other, the civil magistrates who forbid this preaching under the pretext of thus securing public peace, a matter of purely temporal interest. And the Holy Ghost by the voice of Peter declares that the Church must not trouble herself about this prohibition. The inspired writer does not give any assurance that public order will not be troubled; he merely asserts the express will of God, that Christ's Gospel should be preached everywhere.

128. Fourth Argument. Borrowed from ecclesiastical history. The example of the Apostles has been faithfully followed by their successors in the Apostolate not only during the long period of sanguinary persecution, but throughout all the past ages. As the above-quoted Encyclical tells us: "This authority, perfect and dependent only on its divine Author, the Church never ceased to claim as her own, and to exercise publicly without fear. Much more can she invoke in principle and as a matter of historical precedent the assent of rulers and heads of states, who in their negotiations and transactions, by the reciprocal sending of ambassadors and the exchange of other good offices, have always dealt with the Church as with a sovereign and legitimate power. And it was not without a particular disposition of Providence, we may say, that this authority was provided with a civil principality or kingdom as the best safeguard of its independence in the exercise of its lofty functions." (See Part VIII, ch. viii.)

Remark.—There is nothing in common between the superiority of jurisdiction, of which we have just spoken, and *theocracy,* with which opponents strive to confound it. Theocracy, *which is the government of a civil society by a political law divinely revealed and by an authority established by God Himself,* never existed except among the Jewish people, and that only during a certain period of its history. It is true that frequently our adversaries designate by the name of theocracy a pretended domination, which they endeavor to attribute to the clergy in things purely temporal. But the Catholic doctrine, by proclaiming, as we shall now see, the absolute independence of the civil power in this matter renders such domination altogether impossible.

§ II. Independence of the Civil Power

129. Let the State adopt whatever measures it may desire in the matter of custom duties, taxation, the army, public works, etc., as long as it does not infringe upon the laws of God, and the rights of the Church, and the spiritual interests

and chief end of man are not endangered by its legislation, the Church has nothing to say as to these purely secular matters, which concern only the temporal happiness of the people. In other words, the Church does not claim, by virtue of her institution, any power over civil society in matters purely temporal, which are connected only with earthly interests. "Civil order," says Leo XIII in speaking of rulers, "is entirely subject to their power and sovereign authority."

Corollaries. 1. It follows from the preceding thesis that there exists between Church and State a *real distinction*, intended by Jesus Christ. Let us, however, state at the same time that this distinction between the two powers is not *rigorously essential*. For God *could have confided to the same authority* at the same time the double task of securing the temporal and the spiritual end of man. He *might also* have constituted the kings of the earth lieutenants of the Head of the Church, receiving their powers from Him and governing in His name; but He did not so will. In reality Jesus Christ willed that each one of those two ends should be procured by a special authority, distinct and independent in its own sphere of action.

2. From what we have said about the powers conferred by Jesus Christ upon His Church, and the independence which He guaranteed to her with regard to civil authority, it follows, by virtue of the definition already given, that the Church is truly *a perfect society*. Hence, also, follows the condemnation of pagan Cæsarism and all the encroachments of the civil power upon the liberty of the Church which history records.

English history, since the Reformation, furnishes several instances of unwarranted interference in Church matters on the part of political rulers. The following will suffice: The Anglican Bishop Cox was once honored with a short, but very significant encyclical from Queen Elizabeth, a document the like of which, for its claim to spiritual power and its arrogance, has never been issued by any Boniface or Hildebrand of the Catholic Church:

"Proud Prelate—You know what you were before I made

you what you are now. If you do not immediately comply with my request, I will unfrock you, by G—d.

'ELIZABETH.' ''

(Strickland's ''Queens of England,'' vol. VI, p. 234.)

§ III. Rights of the Church

130. It will not be out of place to enumerate here some of the rights which the Church justly and lawfully claims. To deprive the Church of any of these rights, is to attack the independence which belongs to her as a perfect society, possessing in herself, according to the sovereign command of Jesus Christ, her Founder, all the means necessary for her preservation and action in order to attain her end.

A. The Church has the right to fulfill freely her mission and to exercise the powers that she received from her divine Founder, without having to ask the authorization of the civil power, nor can she be subjected to its control or intervention. Accordingly, it depends upon herself alone, in all that concerns the teaching of dogma and morals, the administration of the Sacraments, the election of her Pontiffs, the founding and governing of seminaries and religious communities, the conferring of ecclesiastical offices, etc. No one has the right to prevent the Sovereign Pontiff from communicating with the clergy and the Faithful, nor to impede the promulgation of his decrees, nor to prevent the execution of his Encyclical Letters, called bulls. The so-called *royal placet* and *exequatur,* by which civil rulers sometimes claim to have the right to control the acts of the spiritual power, are illicit and invalid, unless they be the results of a concordat, that is to say, of a *concession* freely made by the ecclesiastical authority itself.

B. As every member of the Church is composed of a double nature, a body and a soul, so he is to be led to his last end by means appropriate to that double nature. Hence, it follows:

a. That the Church has the right to prescribe to her members not only things purely interior and spiritual, but also

things external and corporal, such as fasting, alms-giving, attendance at Church services, etc.

b. That she has the right and the obligation, derived from her Founder, to exercise outwardly and publicly divine worship, and consequently to prescribe exterior and public ceremonies, such as processions, pilgrimages. She has the right to procure the material means necessary for the exercise of worship, the support of her ministers, the construction and preservation of sacred edifices; and since temporal possessions are absolutely necessary to her, she has the right to acquire and own them as her legitimate property, which the secular power is bound to protect.

c. The Church has the right to exact obedience from her members, to constrain rebels to submission by spiritual as well as by corporal penalties, both for their own correction and reform, and for the example and warning of others.

SECOND THESIS.—In case of conflict, that is to say, when in mixed questions, the two authorities impose upon their subjects who are the same persons contradictory obligations, the power of the Church should prevail over that of the State.

131. In temporal matters there are cases in which there intervenes, either regularly or exceptionally, *a spiritual interest to be safeguarded by the Church*, although the matters in question may not be completely transferred to her domain on account of some spiritual interest at stake. This, for instance, is the case as to the temporal possessions of the Church. They are called "mixed things." "Everything," says Leo XIII, "which in human affairs is sacred by whatsoever title, everything which concerns the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either through its nature or with respect to its end, all these things belong to the authority of the Church." In all this the Church finds herself within the sphere of her own jurisdiction, and consequently she has *the right* to exercise her authority, as well towards Governments as towards private individuals. Moreover, history attests that

in questions of this nature, the Church always endeavors to come to an amicable understanding with the State, with a view to settle these questions by a common agreement, rather than to decide them by acts of her supreme authority. Let us add the following words from the Encyclical already quoted above:

"There are times when there prevails another way of securing concord, and guaranteeing peace and liberty. Heads of States and the Sovereign Pontiffs come to an agreement by a *treaty* as to some particular point. Under these circumstances the Church gives striking proofs of her maternal charity by extending as far as possible her indulgent condescensions."

The present thesis is a logical deduction from the preceding one. However, because of its importance in the times in which we live, it is advisable to insist upon some of the arguments usually alleged in its support.

132. First Argument. Taken from the very purpose or end of the Church. This purpose is infinitely more important than that of the State. What, indeed, are, after all, temporal goods compared to those of eternity? "*What doth it profit a man,*" says our Lord, "*if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?*" (Matt. 16, 26.) All the goods of this earth, and *civil society itself,* are evidently nothing else but *means* given by God to man to lead him to the supreme and eternal goal, to the possession of heavenly happiness. Governments, having as their own and immediate purpose the temporal happiness of man, should, therefore, *in all things which concern the last end of man,* be subordinate to the Church. "The art of the pilot," says St. Thomas, "rules that of the sailor, the architect that of the mason, and the arts of peace those of war."

133. Second Argument. Taken from Catholic Tradition and Pontifical decisions. "All the Fathers of the Church," says Cardinal Tarquini, S.J. (1874), in his excellent standard work, "Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones" (Dissertations on the Public Law of the Church), "have always taught that the purpose of civil society and its government

should be subordinate to the Church, just as the body is subject to the soul." This is also shown by *the decisions of the Holy See.* Not only has Pius IX condemned the 42nd proposition of the Syllabus which reads: "In the case of conflict between the two powers, civil law prevails"; but in his celebrated Encyclical *Quanta cura* (Dec. 8, 1864), basing his words on the principles laid down by many of his predecessors, he expresses himself more clearly still: "It is certain that whenever it is a question of divine things, the best interests of earthly rulers would be secured, if they were to adhere to what God has wisely ordained, and submit the royal will to that of the ministers of Christ, and never prefer their own to theirs."

THIRD THESIS.—The Church and State should mutually help each other.

134. The conflicts of which we have spoken are always to be regretted, and they invariably prove hurtful to the State as well as to the Church. Hence it is necessary, as Leo XIII says, "That there should exist between the two powers a well-regulated system of relations, not without analogy to that which in man constitutes the union of soul and body." The wise providence of God, which has established both powers, has supplied their wants by indicating the relations which they are to bear to each other. It is these relations that form the object of this thesis, divided into two parts.

§ VI. The Church Owes Assistance and Protection to the State

135. This duty needs no demonstration, and the Church does not question this obligation, provided there be no denial of her right to determine in a sovereign, independent way its extent and practical bearing. She fulfills this duty by her teaching as to the divine origin of the temporal power and as to the necessity of obedience to all lawful authority; she fulfills it by her prayers, her Sacraments and public worship, which furnish to the subjects of the State the moral strength needed to fulfill their civil obligations. The Church should

also, in case of necessity, make use of spiritual penalties to compel subjects to fulfill their duty to the State; finally, there may occur circumstances in which the Church would consider herself obliged to help the State by pecuniary sacrifices, even by the giving up to the civil power a part of her temporal possessions.

The reader will find numerous instances of her generous sacrifices on behalf of the State in that admirable work of Cardinal Baluffi, "The Charity of the Church," chapters v, vi, and ix, and in "Ecclesiastical History."

§ VII. The Temporal Power in Its Turn Owes Aid and Assistance to the Church

136. 1. Indirectly. **a.** By causing justice, order and tranquillity to reign in the State, so as to permit the Church to exercise efficaciously her salutary action in behalf of the people.

b. In being careful not to encroach upon the rights of the Church, and not to permit anyone to interfere with her in the fulfillment of her divine mission, the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the Sacraments, the exercise of religious worship, and in the spiritual government of her flock.

2. Directly. The State owes to the Church positive and direct assistance, without, however, ever going outside of the sphere that belongs to it. It is its duty, for instance, to place its legislation in harmony with divine and ecclesiastical laws; to sanction, as far as circumstances demand and permit, the laws of the Church, by enforcing temporal penalties on their transgressors; to provide, if necessary, for the support of the clergy and of divine worship.

We shall give a few proofs of this *direct* duty, which is frequently denied.

137. First Argument. Taken from the very purposes or designs of Almighty God. In creating man, God had in view both His own glory and the eternal salvation of His creature, raised by Him to the dignity of His adopted child. It is to secure for him this happiness, that He sent His Son upon the

earth, that He established the Church, and that He desires her propagation and the freedom to which she is justly entitled in the discharge of her mission. If, therefore, He delegates a part of His authority to rulers of States, it is not only that they may assure to their subjects peace and prosperity here on earth, it is also that they may help them to reach the supreme goal of their present existence. Hence, every man should desire and seek for the good things of this world only in so far as they help him to obtain eternal happiness. Hence it results that the depositaries of civil power cannot demand obedience in the name of God, except in view *of this same end.* They should, therefore, labor, as far as circumstances permit and within the limits of their sphere, for the maintenance and progress of the true religion, which alone leads to salvation.

138. Second Argument. Taken from the social royalty of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is God: hence absolute sovereignty over everything that exists belongs essentially to the Deity; He is the King of civil societies as well as of families and their individual members. This royalty has been distinctly proclaimed both in the Old and in the New Testament. "*All kings of the earth shall adore Him,*" says David, "*all nations shall serve Him.*" (Ps. 71, 11.) "*The nation and the kingdom, that will not serve thee, shall perish.*" (Is. 60, 12.) "*And He* (the Lord) *gave Him power and glory and a kingdom; and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve Him; His power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away; and His kingdom that shall not be destroyed.*" (Dan. 7, 14.) "*God hath exalted Him,*" says St. Paul, "*and hath given Him a name which is above all names. That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, in earth and under the earth.*" (Philip. 2, 9–10.) "*Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet; He left nothing not subject to Him.*" (Heb. 2, 8.) Moreover, the emphatic affirmation of the Savior Himself is well known. "*All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.*" (Matt. 28, 18.) By virtue of the authority, which belongs to Him as God, Jesus Christ might have taken into His own hands the *temporal* sceptre of the whole world, just as He did assume to Himself

the spiritual. He did not so will; it pleased Him to leave to rulers power over things purely human. But if His kingdom is not of this world, if He commands men to render to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar, He cannot permit that man should with impunity refuse to render to God what belongs to God. He made His religion obligatory not only on isolated individuals, but also on civil society itself. Nations like individuals are bound to obey the law of the Gospel, and the holders of political power are obliged in conscience to help as much as they can, in order that God's sovereign will may be carried into execution, for *"He is the King of Kings, and the Lord of Lords."* (Apoc. 19, 16.)

139. Third Argument. Drawn from the interest and well-being of the State itself. The prosperity of the State and the realization of its proper and immediate end, that is, the temporal happiness of its members, require that it should contribute according to its ability to the prosperity of the Church. For without religion no civil society can be permanent and prosperous. It is religion that is its basis, because it explains in an authoritative manner the origin of society and the legitimacy of the social power. It is religion that points out what, in the designs of God, is the firm foundation on which loyal obedience rests, and causes justice, charity, peace and concord to reign among its citizens. Evidently, it is the true religion that is here referred to, that is, the religion which contains all the truths without mingling of error, the religion that renders to God the legitimate worship due to Him and gives to man through the Sacraments instituted by Christ the supernatural strength needed to accomplish his duties to God, to himself and to his fellow men. Such religion becomes thereby the strongest support of the State and contributes most efficaciously to the attainment of its special immediate end, which is the temporal welfare of its subjects.

Above all, religion should preside over civil legislation. All laws must be in harmony with God's eternal law, which is the infallible rule of right and wrong. Deprive political legislation of this essential condition, and you strip your legislative measures of all validity before God as well as before

men. It was for this reason that the great legislators of antiquity pretended to a divine assistance and sanction in framing and promulgating their code. Whoever imagines that he can make laws without regard to religion is more a tyrant than a legislator, for, by ignoring or disregarding the rights of God, he will trample under foot those of man. The immortal Washington, the Father and Founder of the great American Republic, was right when he said in his farewell address to the American Nation that "religion and morality are the props of society and the pillars of the State." History tells in its every page that the decline and downfall of nations have ever been caused by immorality and irreligion. This is but the fulfillment of the divine words registered in the book of Proverbs, ch. 14, 34. *"Justice exalteth a nation; but sin maketh nations miserable."* See the able essay of the late Cardinal Manning entitled, "Without God no Commonwealth," in which he proves that the social and civil commonwealth of mankind has its origin and its perpetuity in the knowledge of God, and in obedience to Him springing from that knowledge, so that without God no commonwealth is possible.

140. Fourth Argument. Taken from the formal and explicit declarations of the Church. See, for instance, the Encyclical of Gregory XVI (1832) and of Pius IX (1846), and the 55th, 77th and 78th condemned propositions of the *Syllabus*, issued by Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1864. But let us hear what Leo XIII says on this subject. "Political societies cannot, without crime, so conduct themselves as if God did not exist in any manner, or dispense with religion as a foreign and useless institution, or acknowledge one indifferently, viz., regardless of its truth or falsehood, according to their good pleasure. In honoring the Deity, they must strictly follow the rules and method according to which God has declared that He wished to be honored. Rulers of States must, therefore, hold as holy the name of God and place among their principal duties to befriend religion, to foster it by their benevolence, to protect it with the tutelary authority of the laws and to enact or decide nothing which may be contrary to its in-

tegrity."—"Civil society must, by promoting public prosperity, provide for the welfare of the citizens in such a way as not only to place no obstacles, but to afford every facility to the pursuit and acquirement of that supreme and immutable welfare to which they aspire." Encycl. *Immortale Dei* (1885). "Public power was established for the advantage of those who are governed, and though its proximate end is to lead citizens to prosperity in this terrestrial life, yet it is its peremptory duty not to lessen, but rather to increase for man, the faculty of attaining the supreme and sovereign good which is the eternal felicity of men in the world to come, a task which becomes utterly impossible without religion." Encyclical *Libertas præstantissimum* (1888).

Remark. We have here set forth, taking the Encyclicals of Leo XIII as our guide, the Catholic doctrine as to the relations which should exist between the Church and the State. We must not forget that in this demonstration we have treated the question *as an absolute thesis,* making abstraction of *circumstances* which may modify in practice these relations, in the interest of both societies themselves. In treating further on of tolerance, we shall speak of these circumstances, and show *when* and *how* a Catholic can swear allegiance to a Constitution which departs from these general principles, and even defend it, when necessary.

CHAPTER V

LIBERALISM AND LIBERTY

§ I. General Notions Concerning Liberalism

141. There exists a doctrine that is the very negation of the principles which we have demonstrated concerning the relations between Church and State. This doctrine bears, but wrongfully, the name of *Liberalism,* for it is far from being favorable to liberty, properly understood. It is not easy to define Liberalism in a precise and complete manner, for the reason that it is at most a purely negative system, like Protestantism, and like it, it is susceptible of many degrees. I here

distinguish three kinds of Liberals, a division that includes all the others.

It is important not to confound Liberalism, *as it was* understood during a certain time, with Liberalism *as it is understood to-day;* for the one differs essentially from the other; the name has been simply retained in order more easily to deceive less observant minds.

In former times by Liberalism was understood a political system or rather a political tendency opposed to *Centralism* and to *Absolutism,* favoring in a great measure, the participation of the citizens in the Government of the State, and reserving great autonomy or self-government to individuals, families, private associations, municipalities and provinces, in the management of their several interests. It was, in other words, a tendency favorable to political liberty and to social and individual liberty.

In this ancient sense it is evident that Catholics would be excellent Liberals, or rather that they alone would in our day have the right to bear that name. For Catholics are altogether favorable to political and civil liberty such as we describe it further on; it is Catholics principally who claim for each person, within the reasonable limit of natural right, the liberty to dispose of his person and his acts, to embrace any kind of life or profession according to his free choice, to form associations for any honest purpose, to dispose of his fortune, during life and at death, according to the promptings of his conscience and without interference on the part of the civil power. Catholics also desire the independence of their country and its liberty to govern itself according to its own laws. If they live under a political system that admits modern liberties, they respect that system as suitable to that exceptional state of society; and if they happen to complain, it is when unjust restrictions are imposed upon the liberty of citizens and when the rights held as sacred and inviolable by the Constitution of their country are trampled under foot.

A. There are Liberals to whom the name of Radicals is generally given, because, doing away with every religious restraint, they uproot thereby the very foundations of social

order. "According to these men," says Leo XIII, "there is not in practical life any divine power which man is bound to obey, but everyone is a law unto himself. Hence, comes *independent* morality, as it is called, which, under the guise of liberty, frees the will from the fulfillment of the divine precepts, and leads man to unlimited license."

142. Remarks. 1. Between the Catholic Church and Radical Liberalism, which so allies itself with Naturalism and Free-thought as to be quite undistinguishable from them, there evidently exists *an inevitable and complete opposition.* It is not necessary for us to refute it; this has been done when we demonstrated by convincing arguments the existence of a religion revealed by God, and the obligation for every man to embrace the Catholic Faith under penalty of missing his last end, which is eternal happiness.

2. This doctrine of Liberalism must necessarily produce *the most disastrous results.* Hear what Leo XIII said on this subject: "To make morality depend upon the judgment of human reason alone, is to suppress the essential difference between good and evil; between what is shameful and what is honorable. When such a moral doctrine is admitted, which evidently cannot suffice to repress or control the disordered impulses of the heart, the door is thrown wide open to all the corruptions of licentious life. . . . As soon as the power of God over man and human society is repudiated, it is natural that society should have no religion, and that everything which touches upon religion, should, thenceforward, become an object of most complete indifference. Armed with the idea of its sovereignty, the multitude will be easily led to sedition and to civil disturbances, and the curb of duty and the restraint of conscience being no longer in existence, there will remain nothing but force—powerless when alone—to restrain popular passions. We have the proof of this in the almost daily struggles of civil authority against the *Socialists* and other seditious factions, which have long labored to overthrow the State to its very foundations. Let, then, every man judge and decide for himself, if at all capable of a just appreciation of things, whether such doctrines are conducive to the true

liberty and dignity of manhood, or rather destructive of the same." Encycl. *Libertas præstantissimum* (1888), on "Human Liberty."

B. There is another kind of Liberals, named by Leo XIII *Government Liberals.* These men do not go so far as to openly deny *all* dependence of man with respect to God; they content themselves with asserting the absolute independence of *all civil society* as such. According to them, the divine laws may rule the life and conduct of individuals, but not those of *States;* in public affairs it is allowable to discard the commands of God and to legislate without taking God's law into account; hence arises, as a necessary consequence, *the separation of Church and State.* This kind of Liberalism may be defined as follows: The doctrine which denies all dependence of civil society upon religion. It may also be called Social Rationalism.

Let us enter into a fuller development of this subject. Government or doctrinal Liberalism declares that the nation, as a nation, and all civil powers, of whatever degree in the social hierarchy, are exempt from every obligation, every duty toward religious authority, whatever it be. So far as Liberal Governments are concerned, Christian revelation, Jesus Christ its Author, the Church which He founded and which represents Him on earth, are looked upon as *if they did not exist;* they do not know or care to know if Jesus Christ is God; that question does not concern them, it is a matter which they claim belongs exclusively to individuals; at all events the existence of Jesus Christ and of His Church entails no consequences affecting the action of the State and its various powers. Thus, for instance, the legislator, when he enacts laws, the executive powers and the courts when they apply them, need not stop to consider whether these laws are framed in conformity with the law of God, with the expressed will of Jesus Christ, and the rights which He has conferred upon His Church. As to the members of civil society, they are free, say the Liberals, to live as Christians in their capacity of private citizens; but they are *not to act as such when engaged in the performance of their functions as public men.*

If schools are provided by the Government, they require that the teaching which they call *neutral* or non-sectarian should be given without any reference to religion; for, they say, *all opinions must be respected.* As to morality, in order to deceive the simple-minded, they speak of independent, non-committal and lay morality, as if there could exist a morality, that is, *a binding rule* of morals, without a supreme lawgiver and a sufficient *sanction,* such as Christ has established, and His Church proclaims, viz., eternal reward to the observers of God's law and everlasting punishment to its transgressors. (Matt. 25, 46.) How could such a rule influence the conscience of men, when it is stripped of the truths which alone can supply motives sufficiently strong to induce men to execute it?

143. Remark. 1. Though Government Liberalism is not as openly impious as Radical Liberalism, it contains, nevertheless a doctrine diametrically opposed to that which we have set forth with respect to the relations that should, in principle, exist between the two powers. We have, therefore, already practically refuted it, grounding our thesis on sound proofs. It follows that a faithful member of the Church cannot entertain any doubt about this subject. (nn. 135–140.) For be it not forgotten, this doctrine of Liberalism is held by its advocates as applicable to all times and to all places. Let us hear the judgment pronounced by Leo XIII on the point at issue: "That it should be thus (that is, in order that the State should have no duty to perform towards the Church), it would be necessary that the civil community should have no duty to perform towards God, or that it should be enabled to free itself therefrom with impunity, which is manifestly false. For it cannot be doubted but that the assembling of men in society is the work of God's will, and this is so whether it be considered in its members, in its form, which is authority, in its cause, or in the number and importance of the advantages which it procures for man. It is God who made man for society and united him to his fellow men, in order that the requirements of his nature, for which his single unaided efforts would not suffice, should find the needed help in association.

Hence, civil society, as such, must necessarily acknowledge God as its principle and Author, and consequently render to God's power and authority the social homage and worship due to Him. Neither on the ground of justice, nor on that of reason, can the State ever be atheistic, or what would inevitably lead to atheism, can it maintain the same attitude toward all religions whether true or false, or accord to all indiscriminately the same rights." Encycl. *Libertas præstantissimum* (1888).

2. If these Government Liberals were logical, they would inevitably *end in Radicalism,* and this is what actually happens to those among them who consistently follow their principles to their last conclusions. For, if God has no authority over man as a social being, that is, as a being associated with his fellows in the pursuit of temporal goods, why should God have any authority over him in his private life? Now God, the Creator, is either the absolute Master of man, everywhere and always, or else He is not his master and sovereign in anything whatsoever.

3. We shall see, in what we shall have to say about what are called *modern liberties,* some of the disastrous but inevitable effects of Liberalism in government.

144. **C.** This would be the place to speak of a third kind of Liberalism, which was in vogue during a certain period and which was called Catholic Liberalism or Semi-Liberalism. But this error, which comprised many degrees and many shades, has had its day, and we consider it needless to devote any time to its consideration. Leo XIII has powerfully contributed to bring back union in the truth and in charity, and this was not the least of the benefits of his glorious pontificate.

As it generally happens, there have been men who, heartily attached to the Church and wishing to foster her interest, have labored to effect an impossible reconciliation between the doctrines of Liberalism and those of the Church, dreaming that newer and better times had happily arrived for the realization of an absolute reciprocal independence between the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal. They thought that the Church would be acting prudently, if she would keep

silent as to the Catholic truths opposed to current errors of the day, and neglect to vindicate those of her rights which are not in harmony with what are called *modern ideas,* and relying only upon *common right.* But truth cannot countenance such compromises. Undoubtedly the Church can and should at certain times, on account of peculiar circumstances of time and place, *tolerate in her* midst the existence of error and evil, but she can never see in such a state of things a *normal* condition, true *progress* and a *definitive* state of society.

145. Remark. The principles held by Liberalism must not be confounded with the Liberal Party. It is those principles themselves that we are now denouncing. As to the Liberal Party, we understand by it, in Catholic countries, the party of men who combine their efforts to make war upon the Church and to fight against her salutary influence. There is one palpable fact, attested by the history of this century; wherever Liberalism becomes predominant, there persecution is at once waged against the divine work.

This is exactly the sad spectable witnessed in our day (1902) in unhappy France, where an infidel Government wages an implacable war against religious Orders, expelled from their abode in the name of liberty! We may here exclaim with Madame de Roland when about to be guillotined, O Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!

As long as they fear the number and the zeal of Catholics, the Liberals loudly demand liberty in everything and for all. As soon as they consider themselves powerful enough to defy the Catholics, they hasten to exclude them from the benefit of the common right. For Liberalism, the ideal to be realized is the return of old pagan Cæsarism; it is that the head of the Government, one or many, should be the only sovereign ruler, tolerating at its side no spiritual power unless subject to itself and entirely subservient to its interests and *by the monopoly of atheistic schools* holding supreme control over the education of society. In those countries where the law and public conscience do not permit them to realize their ideal, they endeavor to attain it as much as possible by administrative measures, as perfidious as they are bitter and persistent.

There is, however, a difference between the persecution of the present day and that of the past centuries; to-day it is *universal* and *everywhere the same,* having for its end *the complete destruction* of the only true Church of Jesus Christ. This is because the true inspirer and promoter of persecution is Freemasonry, of which Liberalism is the slave

146. To be convinced of the wickedness of the theories here referred to, and of their disastrous consequences when reduced to practice, we need but recall some of the principles put forward by their advocates. The following will suffice: "Liberalism, if it be anything, is hostility to the Church, or it is nothing." "Liberalism is bound to wage incessant war against the Church, and always uphold her enemies." "Liberalism is freethought, or it is nothing." "Nothing can be at the same time Liberal in politics, and Catholic in religion." When we recall such abominable maxims, we cannot but approve the justice of the Church's condemnation of Liberalism, for it is *false, impious* and *disastrous* to society. (1) It is false, being contrary to reason, and to the positive, explicit words of Jesus Christ, the Supreme Lawgiver. Reason, as we proved above (nn. 138, 139), tells us that civil society must be religious, and consequently that rulers and Governments ought to protect the spiritual interests of their subjects and of the Church. Jesus Christ, by imposing the obligation of Baptism on all mankind, evidently wished that all the members of civil society should be *Christian;* and, therefore, kings and princes should do nothing against the Christian religion and its authoritative exponent, the Catholic Church, whom we have proved to be the true Church of Jesus Christ (Part VI). Now the spirit of Liberalism contradicts the dictates of reason and the word of Jesus Christ; therefore, Liberalism must be *false* in principle.

(2) Moreover, this principle is *impious,* tending, as it does, to destroy religion in the hearts of the people by upholding the absurd theory that we are at liberty to profess any religion, whether true or false, pagan or Christian.

(3) Lastly, this principle is *disastrous* to society, because a society or nation without religion is a society without morals;

without the principles of justice, of order and of virtue. It is a prey to evil passions, to revolutions and all disorders. The Church, then, who combats such great evils, is the true protectress of the State and of the rights of the people.

§ II. Modern Liberties

147. Liberalism is looked upon as the father and promoter of modern liberties; it boasts of having given them birth, and proclaims them as the grand and immortal conquests of our times. Hence, it has been defined, though incompletely: the system which preaches and favors modern liberties; and again, the doctrine which recognizes and assures equal rights to error and truth, to good and evil. Let us see in the present chapter what we should think of these liberties in themselves and in their effects, and in the following what should be our attitude with respect to a State Constitution or legislation based upon these liberties.

148. **A.** What Is Understood by Modern Liberties? Under this name are generally comprised liberty of conscience or of worship, liberty of the press, liberty of education, and liberty of association.

Liberty of *conscience* claims to secure to every man the *right* to profess and propagate any religion he may please, or to profess no religion at all. It demands that the *State,* practically atheistic, should not render worship to God; that no religion be privileged, even when the nation by a great majority professes the Catholic Faith. Liberty of the *press* proclaims the *right* to express by the pen, to propagate by writings any doctrine whatsoever on all questions, moral, political, social and religious, no matter how much such teachings may be defiled by impiety or immorality. Liberty of education contends that every man has *the natural right* to propagate these doctrines by means of public teaching, in government institutions and in other ways. Liberty of *association* holds as a natural *right* the faculty of forming any society, even secret (Masonic) and contrary to religion and the moral order. Let us observe that here it is not question of mere *tolerance,*

with the view of avoiding greater evils, but of acknowledging what is declared to be *a natural, sacred and inviolable right.* It is true that certain restrictions as to the use of these liberties are devised and admitted; but, besides being *illogical,* these restrictions are no more than *theoretic.* In the sight of the modern State, it is not even an impiety to publicly teach the non-existence of God.

It goes without saying that here we treat of these three last liberties (of the press, of education and of association), from the religious point of view. As long as dogma and morals are not concerned, Church authority has no occasion to interfere, it would be going out of its sphere to do so.

148. **B.** What Should Be Thought of These Modern Liberties. In the first place, they are false in principle. We have shown that the Catholic religion is *the only true religion,* and as such binds all men that may come to its knowledge, and that this historical, divine religion is identical with the Roman Catholic Church. As it is *the duty* of every man to save his soul, to attain his last end, this Church *alone* has, by the will of God, the right to establish herself, to spread herself, and to exact belief and obedience from all men. Every doctrine that combats her doctrinal teachings, every moral system that is opposed to her moral principles, is condemned in advance and without appeal, because it resists dogmatic and moral truth. Religious error and moral evil, which are the poison of the mind and of the will, cannot have the right to propagate themselves among men, who were made to know the truth in matters of religion and morality, as well as in any other subject within their reach. Truth is the natural object of the intellect, as good is the natural object of the will.

Hence, it follows that neither the individual citizen, nor the Government can lawfully oppose obstacles to this *exclusive right* of the Catholic Church. For right and duty are two correlative terms; he who admits the *right* in the one, necessarily affirms the *duty* in the others to respect that right. It follows also that no individual or Government can acknowledge and concede to error and to evil, to heresy, to impiety, to immorality, *a natural right* to exist and propagate them-

selves, as such a right does not really belong to them, but is, on the contrary, the exclusive prerogative of truth and virtue.

Therefore, no consistent and loyal Catholic may admit the doctrine that concedes the liberty of error, and places it and truth on the footing of equality before the civil authority, because error has no rights and can never be harmless. Whilst denying all rights to error, we are far from contesting the natural, political or civil and personal rights of those who wittingly or unwittingly personally adhere to it. It is one thing to combat false principles, and quite another thing to assail the individuals who unfortunately profess them. The Church is always intolerant of false doctrines and erroneous principles, just as she is intolerant of vice, though full of mercy for the men who are its slaves. She follows the example of Almighty God, who hates sin, but receives repenting sinners with bounty and compassion. We must follow the Christian maxim of St. Augustine: *Diligite homines, sed interficite errores*—Love men, but kill their errors.

Here then is *our thesis,* or our impregnable position, an unqualified condemnation of modern liberties. What are they indeed but the proclamation of the rights of error and evil, the denial of the respect and protection due to the exclusive rights of the Catholic Church? This is what results from their very definition, such as we have given before (n. 130).

149. Secondly, these liberties entail pernicious consequences on individuals and society. "The evils of the present day," says Leo XIII, "whose number and gravity we cannot hide from ourselves, come, in great part, from those much vaunted liberties, wherein men thought to find the germs of salvation and glory. This hope has been shattered by facts. In place of sweet and salutary fruits, bitter and poisoned fruits have been produced." Let us indicate briefly some of the disastrous effects resulting from the application of Liberal doctrines.

First Effect. The gradual weakening *of Faith and religion,* soon followed by their total extinction. It is already difficult for a man, even an educated man, to escape unhurt from the influence of the social environment in which he lives. When that society in which he moves offers the spectacle of

religious indifference, how difficult it is for him to remain attached, heart and soul, to religion, to constantly practice the duties it enjoins? What will it be when the masses, that is to say, the common people and the illiterate, will see the rulers of the State, the men invested with public power, showing themselves indifferent with regard to the Catholic religion, affecting to make no distinction between religious truth and religious error? They will soon lose all moral sense and look upon religion as a thing of slight or no importance. Even if these examples had not such a deplorable effect upon the people, wicked publications, so largely multiplied and so perfidious in their aim, aided, no doubt, by the so-called neutral, or unsectarian, that is, Godless education, will not fail to destroy insensibly but surely all remnants of Faith in their hearts. It is precisely because they count upon this inevitable effect of modern liberties that the Liberals endeavor at times to calm the impatience of those who would have recourse to open violence and destroy the Church.

150. Second Effect. From the perversion of the mind and contempt of religion *to perversion of the heart*, there is but an easy step. Why should the man who has not in his heart the love of God, nor the fear of His justice, nor the prospect of eternal reward, why should he not abandon himself to the violence of his passions? Man longs for happiness; if he seeks it not where it is, in noble submission to God, in purity of conscience and the firm hope of eternal goods, he necessarily seeks it in the criminal gratification of his passions, even the lowest and most brutal. Sad experience here speaks too loudly, and exempts us from insisting any further on this point.

Third Effect. From the prevalence of those liberties arise the perils that *threaten modern society*. Once freed from the salutary restraint of religion, why should not the poor cast looks of envy on the possessions of the rich, and why, if they be the stronger, should they not seize upon that which excites their covetousness? "Should we be surprised," says Leo XIII, "that men of inferior condition should be enviously desirous of raising themselves as high as those who are the

owners of palaces and the possessors of far greater fortune than themselves? Shall we then be surprised if there be no security for public or private life and if mankind have almost arrived at the extreme stage of its existence?'' It is to this desperate stage that the doctrine of Liberalism inevitably leads. In all this the Anarchists of all countries only drive Liberal principles to their ultimate consequences. Assuredly many men who profess these doctrines and who preach them to the people do not see the disastrous consequences to which they finally lead. But their lack of foresight does not destroy the logic of facts. Logic is, indeed, merciless in its ultimate results. Sooner or later the Socialistic maxims bear their fruits and are transformed into open acts of violence, that is, into general disorder and revolution.

''When they have once lost all belief in an endless existence to come, where each one shall receive either reward or punishment, according to his deeds, the populace, terribly logical in their conclusions, will necessarily and consistently demand complete equality in this, and they will demand it with irresistible determination, grinding their teeth with rage, with hatred in their heart, and murderous weapons in their hands. They will say: 'My soul is, after all, only an ephemeral being, destined sooner or later to annihilation; and God is only an hypothetical existence. You, leaders of public opinion, by your writings and public utterances, have delivered us from the uncomfortable fear of hell, and have stripped us of the sweet hope of heaven. Well, fear of punishment and hope of heaven being done away with, there remains for us nothing but the earth. We demand it, and we shall have it.' '' (Mgr. Mermillod. See further on in Part VIII, Chapter I.)

Objection. There exists a specious objection to which it is important to reply. It is this: God, the supreme lawgiver, has granted liberty to man; society or civil power can, therefore, do the same thing, and consequently grant full liberty to its citizens.

151. Answer. 1. To answer this difficulty, it is sufficient to call to mind the *essential distinction* between physical liberty or *natural power* to do a thing, and moral liberty or the

right to do it. God, say you, has given liberty to man. That is true, but what is this liberty? *Physical* liberty, that is to say, the ability to choose between good and evil, has, indeed, been bestowed upon all human individuals, but far from intending that man should use it to do evil, God has, on the contrary, *imposed on him the moral* obligation to use it in the attainment of his last end, by doing good. This is so true, that God threatens to inflict the punishment of hell on the man who will abuse his liberty by choosing evil; and he retains the right *to punish him eternally.* Whether civil society wills it or not, it cannot deprive man of physical liberty; but it would not be imitating God if society claimed to grant him the right to do evil *with impunity.*

2. To be able *legitimately* to imitate any one, a person must be in an analogous situation with him whom he takes as his model. Now, from the point of view of liberty, there are many *important differences* between the divine and the human government.

a. "God is judge," says St. Thomas, "because He is the Creator," and in Him the judicial act and the creative act touch each other throughout the insignificant duration of time. When one has eternity at his disposal, as God has, why hasten to do justice? Is human government in the same condition?

As St. Augustine tells us, God is patient because He is eternal. He can afford to tolerate in the brief space of time sins that are to be inevitably punished in eternity, if not repented of before death.

b. Whilst awaiting the supreme and inevitable reparation, God has placed, *during this life,* side by side with physical liberty, all the necessary restraints or *correctives,* such as commands, exhortations, promises, threats, interior graces, etc., which *protect* the liberty of the good and restrict that of the wicked.

There is no better exposition of man's relation to God, his Creator and supreme Judge, than that which the Lord Himself has revealed to us in the book of Ecclesiasticus 15, 14–18: "*God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel.* (Behold here the gift of

physical liberty.) *He added His commandments and precepts.* (Behold here the moral law restraining man's free will within the proper bounds.) *If thou wilt keep the commandments, and perform acceptable fidelity forever, they shall preserve thee. He hath set water and fire before thee; stretch forth thy hand to which thou wilt. Before man is life and death, good and evil; that which he shall choose shall be given him.*"

Moreover, God has created domestic society and civil society, and He has invested both of them with the right of punishment. To fathers He even gives the command to punish their children and not to spare the rod (Prov. 13, 24, and 22, 15), and St. Paul in his letter to the Romans (13, 3–4) states in the clearest terms the right and power with which civil rulers have been divinely invested, of punishing their rebellious and criminal subjects. "*Rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. . . . For he* (the ruler) *beareth not the sword in vain. For he is the minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.*"

152. Remark. From what precedes, it clearly follows that it is indeed very wrong to accuse of intolerance or tyranny either the Church or the State, when, as in the Middle Ages, they endeavored to regulate the legitimate exercise of the human will, to restrain it within proper bounds, to diminish the opportunities of their subjects doing evil and rushing into calamities and ruin. These just restrictions upon the liberty of doing ill, far from being acts of *violence,* are, on the contrary, a great benefit granted to society, for they render the fulfillment of their duties more easy to its members, and their violation more difficult. This benefit is secured to them by the close alliance of Church and State, when such union is made possible by circumstances. Hence, in protecting the Church of Jesus Christ, and in forbidding other kinds of worship contrary to it, the State does not do violence to the liberty of man, but helps him *in his weakness,* preventing him from straying from the right path. It would be evidently absurd to claim that it is trespassing on the rights of the human *intelligence* to enlighten it so as to prevent it from

taking the false for the true; why then should they pretend that it is tyranny, that it is doing violence to the will of man, to remove the opportunities that lead it to evil, and to aid it to attain its proper object which is good? As well say that the parapet of a bridge is an obstacle in the free passage of travelers. As well say that a father of a family abuses the rights of his children in preventing immoral or impious doctrines from infecting their innocent and candid souls and in forbidding everything that might corrupt them! Moreover, to repeat it once more, man can never have the right to be a blasphemer, to be impious or vicious, and the State does not *violate any right* of its subjects in preventing them from destroying in their fellow citizens the beliefs necessary for eternal salvation and from sapping the foundations of morality, which constitutes the basis of civil as well as religious society.

Let us add that it is strange to see these sophists admit on the one hand that it is not infringing upon liberty to forbid and punish certain crimes, as murder, theft, incendiarism, which may be hurtful to their temporal welfare, and on the other cry out against tyranny, because, forsooth, authority removes causes of disasters much more fatal, as they endanger the attainment of their *eternal happiness.*

§ III. Tolerance

153. Must we conclude, from what we have said, that a true Catholic should never accept and defend a political Constitution which admits modern liberties? Far from it. Listen to what Leo XIII says on this subject:

"In her maternal appreciation, the Church takes into account the overwhelming weight of human infirmity, and she does not ignore the movement which in our day carries away minds and things. For these motives, though she grants *rights* only to that which is true and honest, she does not, however, raise opposition to that *tolerance* which civil rulers are allowing with respect to certain things contrary to truth and justice; and this she does with the view of hindering greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some considerable good. In

other words, if the Church necessarily condemns, as a matter of *principle,* those false or noxious liberties, she acknowledges at the same time that there are *circumstances* in which these liberties (n. 148) may be licitly tolerated." To speak of tolerance always supposes an evil thing, which is borne with and permitted for grave motives. "If the Church," again says the same Pontiff, "judges that it is not permissible to place the various forms of worship on the same footing as the true religion, she does not thereby condemn the rulers of States, who, in view of a good purpose to be attained or of an evil to be avoided, tolerate in practice that these various forms of worship should, each of them, have its place in the State."

Undoubtedly a loyal son of the Church cannot admit that man possesses the natural right to profess any religion whatsoever, to spread error and evil by means of the press or by teaching. Modern liberties are, therefore, in themselves bad and worthy of condemnation; that is the *thesis.* However, there are circumstances of time and country, which permit one through conscientious motives to tolerate them, to uphold them, to adopt them, to defend them, because by so doing greater evils are avoided; this is the *hypothesis,* or supposition.

This distinction between the *thesis* and the *hypothesis* is met with in a multitude of occasions in practical life, and common sense imposes it often, even when we do not realize its necessity. The hypothesis is the application of the principles of the thesis within the limits of right and justice. Thus, to correct a misbehaving child is the duty of a parent; that is the thesis; to correct the child at a given moment or in a given way, may be an act of imprudence; this is the hypothesis. Food is necessary to support animal life; this is the thesis; but the same food might be injurious to a sick man; this is the hypothesis. It is the same as to religious truth. Truth possesses rights that are inviolable and exclusive; but circumstances may require that the exact, rigorous exercise of these rights should not be insisted on and that toleration should be granted to error or to evil, in order to avoid greater calamities in social life.

We shall now point out some of the reasons which justify the lawfulness of toleration in the circumstances mentioned above.

154. 1. *The interest itself of the Church* and of her divine mission may require this toleration. It is an assured principle that, of two evils, we should choose the less, and that an evil may be legitimately tolerated in order to avoid a greater one. But, in a given country and circumstances, where the modern liberties laid down in the national Constitution have passed into facts and practice, the interest of truth and religion may require that such a state of things should be allowed to continue, at least for a time, in order to avoid a greater evil. In this supposition any attempt to abolish these liberties already established would not serve the best interests of the Church, but would rather arouse against her hatred and reprisals, and expose the State to deplorable discussions and discords.

2. Moreover, *this is the teaching of sound theology,* according to the doctrine of St. Thomas; in certain cases the toleration even of heathen worship may be recognized as legitimate. With greater reason then may the toleration of modern liberties be held as lawful, because even the most flagrant abuse of these liberties does not, like paganism, go as far as to deify the creature and even to deify vice itself.

155. 3. *The conduct of the Church* proves the lawfulness of this toleration. If toleration of modern liberties were never to be allowed, the Church should have obliged Constantine, on the very day of his conversion, to suppress within his Empire every form of pagan worship. In the case of the return to the Faith of a Protestant ruler she should also require on his part the immediate exclusion of all Protestant forms of worship.

The Church has never acted in this manner, and it is not at all in this sense that Gregory XVI in the Encyclical *Mirari vos* (1832), and Pius IX in the Encyclical *Quanta cura,* have condemned these liberties.

We find in the Roman review *Civiltà Cattolica* a page, written in 1868, that summarizes very clearly the doctrine which we have just set forth:

"With the exception of a very small number of unreflecting minds, all sincere Catholics hold that the liberty of worship is *absurd as a principle*. Is it not as monstrous from the social as well as from the individual point of view, to put truth and error on the same footing, and to accord to them the same rights? Catholics, therefore, hold that such a principle, applied to the political body, cannot, by its nature, be otherwise than harmful. However, they also admit that in certain cases we must know how to bear with this evil, because there are circumstances in which, owing to the ill-will of the subject, unity in religion cannot be imposed upon him without resorting to violence, a thing altogether adverse to Catholic principles. It would be killing the sick to apply to them the treatment suitable to healthy people. But who can, unless insane, pretend that the treatment adopted for the sick is the ideal system of hygiene, and that everybody should be subjected to it? It is impossible to govern otherwise than with freedom of worship properly understood a people among whom religious unity does not exist, and who are socially divided by diversity of worship. But to represent this state of things as a state of social perfection, to pretend that it should be introduced in places where its introduction is not required by imperious necessity, would be as absurd as to say that medicine is the true food of man, or that nothing is more conducive to preserving purity of morals in a family than to open wide the doors to all kinds of perverted and corrupt people."

156. Corollaries. What we have said above gives the answer to many seeming difficulties.

1. We see that there is no incompatibility between the duties of a good *Catholic* and those of a good *citizen* in a country where modern liberties are proclaimed in the Constitution of the State. This pretended incompatibility between religious and civil duties is manifestly implied in the motto devised by the advocates of Liberalism and its modern Liberalistic doctrines. "Our policy," they say, "is to be Catholic with the Pope and Liberal with the Government." It is easy to perceive that this motto involves contradictory characters,

which cannot coexist in the same subject. If Papal Catholicism is the truth, and we have proved it to be such, its contradictory, Liberalism, must be false. In fact, he that is Catholic with the Pope, holds with him those principles which should regulate civil Governments, such as truth, justice, morality, order, etc. He that professes with the Government any right, just, true, moral and wholesome principles, professes them together with the Pope. Hence we fail to see how the fulfillment of these two duties to the Sovereign Pontiff on one hand, and to civil authority on the other, can be said to be utterly irreconcilable. But if the words "Liberal with the Government" imply a profession of such Liberalism as we described above (n. 141 *seqq.*) which the Pope cannot hold, and which is therefore inconsistent with Catholicism, then we admit that these two conditions or characters are absolutely incompatible, viz., adherence to the teachings of the Vicar of Christ and submission to the behests of Liberalism.

2. It is in this way that we can account for the *difference of conduct* of the Church in different countries as to what relates to liberty granted to dissenting sects. In a state where the Church enjoys all her rights, it would be prejudicial to the success of her divine mission to yield a place to error and evil. Hence, she cannot, without failing in her duty, permit such an innovation. On the contrary, in a country where the true religion is oppressed, where liberty exists only for those who attack and harass her, it is easily understood that the Church should accept civil toleration, that is, the introduction of an exceptional order of things, she being satisfied with retaining at least a part of her rights.

3. It can easily be seen why, under a political Constitution securing liberty of worship to all, the Church *should energetically claim,* as she does, her share of liberty under the Constitution. It would be ridiculous to say that in doing this, the Church abandons her own principles or that she abdicates thereby her rights. She acts simply as a proprietor, who by the triumph of Socialism, sees himself despoiled of his possessions, and afterwards, by virtue of the very principles of Socialism, claims his share of the common mass of goods.

Evidently such proprietor would not, in doing this, be renouncing his own principles, but would simply be adopting a legitimate means of recovering at least a portion of his own fortune unjustly taken from him, and he would do so by invoking, as an argument *ad hominem,* the Communistic principle itself, which claims that earthly goods should be equally divided among men.

157. Remarks. 1. Care must be taken not to confound *practical* toleration, of which we have just spoken, with *dogmatic* toleration which reduces itself to *theoretical* indifference. Dogmatic tolerance is essentially wrong and formally condemned by the Church. (Encycl. *Mirari vos* and *Quanta cura,* quoted above, n. 155.) It is, indeed, downright impiety for the State to show itself indifferent as to all forms of worship, when it so acts, not because of the special difficulties of the times and in the interest of the Church herself, but because *it believes and professes* that all religions are equally indifferent or equally good. (Part VIII, ch. i.)

2. Though civil toleration is licit under the circumstances indicated, the *things thus tolerated* by modern Constitutions do not thereby cease to be reprehensible in themselves, before God and before the individual conscience. If, because of the liberty of the press, the civil power permits the publication of the most frightful blasphemies and the sale and circulation of immoral books, these outrages against the Divinity and against good morals are, from the point of view of conscience, none the less horrible crimes. It is the same as to all actions intrinsically bad, which legislators may sometimes tolerate for very serious reasons, but those who commit them are none the less condemned by the Divine Legislator, who will not fail to punish them in His own time.

3. The Church cannot permit that it should be proclaimed, as a general and absolute principle, that the liberty granted to heterodox sects for the propagation of errors and evil is what is best and most conformable to the nature of man and true civilization. She cannot admit that liberty granted to everything that causes the loss of souls is good or honest in itself, nor recognize in this liberty the evidence of a progres-

sive society. Hence, Pius IX has condemned the following proposition: "The best condition of political society demands in our times that every State be constituted and governed without any thought as to religion, as if it did not exist, or at least without making any difference between the true religion and a false one." (Encycl. *Quanta cura,* and *Syll.,* Prop. 77, 78, 79, 80.)

Every true Catholic, therefore, will be on his guard against asserting that freedom of worship *is the best condition of things, absolutely speaking;* he will not say that civil toleration is the result of *a natural, sacred and inviolable right* for those who are in the possession of this liberty. He will, on the contrary, frankly proclaim the true principles, the exclusive rights of the truth and of the Church of Jesus Christ. Whilst admitting the present abnormal conditions of his country, he will, nevertheless, deplore the state of things made necessary by those conditions, and the blindness of some people who look upon the adoption of modern liberties as the sure guarantee of a prosperous Government. He will neglect nothing that may *peacefully* improve the situation, *making use of all legal means* recognized as legitimate by the Constitution itself. By spreading around him the whole truth by word of mouth and by writings, he will endeavor to make possible, by the return of erring minds to the profession of true principles, the full observance of the laws of Christian society, an earnest of prosperity to the State as well as to the Church.

158. 4. To remove misconceptions we here reproduce a decision of the Roman Congregation of the Holy Office, issued August 29, 1877. It is as follows:

"The Church by condemning Liberalism does not intend to condemn the several political parties which happen to call themselves *Liberals,* as her decisions refer exclusively to errors opposed to Catholic doctrine." (n. 141.)

5. As the Catholic principle regarding civil tolerance, which we have advocated above (n. 157), must in practice admit of modifications relative to the exercise of religious worship, for the reasons alleged above (n. 153), the following rules should be borne in mind:

(a) When a country is in possession of the truth, that is to say, when it is Catholic, the laws also must be Catholic in their spirit, and tend to the defense of truth against error.

(b) In a country, where there are several religious forms of worship, but where the Catholic religion predominates, the latter must be the favored one. Hence false worships may be simply tolerated so long as they remain inoffensive, and are not aggressive.

(c) In a country where there are many religions, and where no one predominates, the law may extend equal protection to all, so long as those who profess them do not disturb the public peace.

(d) In a country, where many religions exist, and where error predominates, the law cannot prohibit or restrict Catholic truth, under the pretext that it is dangerous to the State; for such could never be the case, seeing that Catholicism is shown to be a divine institution, highly beneficial to both the State and to its citizens.

(e) In countries entirely infidel, heretical, schismatical, or pagan, the civil authority has no right to hinder the introduction or propagation of Catholic Faith so long as this is done by means of persuasion, viz., by instructing the people in the tenets of Catholic doctrine, and exhibiting to them the evidences and arguments in favor of its divine truth.

(f) Lastly persecution cannot be lawful in favor of either truth or error. We mean persecution properly so called, that is to say, violence employed against an unoffending religion whether it be true or false. ("Religious Instruction," by Fr. Schouppe, S.J.)

§ IV. A Few Considerations Concerning Liberty and Its Different Kinds

159. It seems to us expedient to add here a few considerations concerning liberty, because there are few questions around which want of reflection or bad faith has accumulated more errors and dangerous sophisms. "If in the discussions which are carried on concerning liberty," says Leo XIII in

the Encyclical *Libertas præstantissimum* (June 20, 1888), "were understood legitimate and proper liberty, which reason and our words have described, no one could cast up any more against the Church the reproach made against her with supreme injustice, namely, that she is the enemy of the liberty of States. The attitude of the Church regarding this excellent gift that God granted to man, has always been such as to deserve the gratitude of mankind. And yet there are many who persist in believing that the Church is the enemy of human liberty. The cause of this misconception is the imperfect and wrong idea of liberty which some people form. For, through the very alteration of the true idea of liberty, or through the unwarrantable extension attributed to its scope, it is applied to many things in which man, according to the judgment of sound reason, cannot be independent and free."

How many men, indeed, confound true liberty with a chimerical and criminal independence or downright license?

To be independent means to owe nothing to anyone, and consequently, to have received nothing and to stand in need of nothing from anyone whomsoever. This absolute independence belongs and can only belong to God, because He alone possesses in Himself the reason of His existence and of all His perfections, for He is Himself His own end, and the source of His infinite felicity. Man, on the contrary, receives from God his existence, his faculties and everything that serves to develop them and to exercise them. If God ceased for one moment to preserve him from the abyss of nothingness, he would at once be precipitated into it. It follows that man depends completely and at every moment upon the Creator; he is dependent *by essence,* because of his essence to be a creature. He is much more so in the order of grace and glory, to which divine bounty has raised him. Hence, our Savior's words to His disciples "*Without me you can do nothing*" (John 15, 5), are perfectly true both in the natural and the supernatural order. (Rom. 11, 35; I Cor. 4, 37.)

How many others see in the base physical power which they possess to do evil, the *right* to do it! If man really held *from his nature the right* to write everything, to teach every-

thing, to do everything that pleased him, it is evident that *modern liberties* would be completely lawful in themselves.

Hence we see that where liberty is concerned it is of the greatest importance to make clear distinctions. We shall endeavor to say enough to warn our readers against sophisms so dangerous in this matter.

In general the word liberty implies freedom from constraint. But as there are constraints of various kinds, so there are many kinds of liberty. Physical or *psychological* liberty is one thing, *moral* liberty is quite another; nor can *political* liberty be confounded with *civil* or *social* liberty; and when men speak of *modern liberties,* they again attach a different sense to the word liberty.

160. 1. Physical or *psychological* liberty, which is also called liberty of indifference, liberty of choice, *free will,* consists in this, that when all the conditions necessary for action are present, one will retain the (physical) faculty or power of acting or not acting, of determining himself to choose one thing or another. Hence, the essence of liberty is the right to determine or to choose by oneself, and not at all the right to choose evil. In fact, God is infinitely free, and yet He cannot will anything but what is good; but He freely chooses between the various forms and the various degrees of good whichever He wishes to realize outside of Himself in the created order. The Saints in heaven are also free, and yet evil has become impossible for them; enlightened as they are by the full light of truth and possessing the Infinite Good, how could they have the slightest thought or the slightest desire to renounce this perfect happiness? (See "Manual of Catholic Theology, based on Scheeben's Dogmatik," New York, The Catholic Publication Society, 1899, vol. 1. "The Absolute Freedom and Moral Perfection of God's Will," pp. 230–246; Cardinal Mazzella, "De Deo creante," p. 816, where he very ably treats the question of the confirmation of the Saints in grace, and proves that the just in heaven are intrinsically impeccable, though perfectly free.)

The possibility of doing evil is a veritable imperfection, a weakness, a want of power in the human will here on earth.

Surely no man would boast of having the *power* of being ill; but he would rather say that he was unfortunately without the power of enjoying perfect health. With regard to the intellect, no man will see a sign of mental strength in the possibility of reasoning erroneously and drawing false conclusions from true principles.

To illustrate this thought by some examples drawn from the physical order, who would be so silly as to pride himself on the power of being able to draw *crooked* instead of straight lines? In this connection let me relate here the often quoted story of the O of Giotto, the famous Florentine painter (d. 1336). The Pope, anxious to secure his services, sent a messenger to ask the painter for a specimen of his art. Giotto, who was very courteous, took a sheet of paper and a pencil dipped in red color; then, resting his elbow on his side, to form a sort of compass, with one turn of his hand he drew a circle so perfect and exact that it was a marvel to behold, and handed this to the courtier as a sufficient proof of his technical skill. Hence, the origin of the Italian phrase "As round as Giotto's O."

What should we think of a painter or a draughtsman boasting of his ability to draw crooked circles? A similar judgment should be passed on those who are proud of possessing the power of straying from the path of right and justice in the exercise of their free will.

Let us then be consistent, and apply the same language to the liberty of man; we must say that the power to choose *evil* and violate the moral law, that is to say, the power to wander away from our last end, far from being a true power, a perfection, is on the contrary an imperfection, laid upon our will so long as we are on earth in this time of *trial* of the present life.

That man possesses free will is an undeniable fact, proven as it is by the analysis of our free acts, by our own inner sense and by the testimony of all mankind. Moreover, to deny free will in man would be to overthrow the foundation of all morality and destroy society itself.

There have been philosophers called fatalists (fatalism naturally flows from materialism), who have ventured to deny the existence of free will. But this negation does not and cannot exist elsewhere than on their lips. Repudiated by the whole human race, it is contradicted by the actions, the words and the writings of these same philosophers. Every tongue which pronounces the words virtue and vice, merit and demerit, praise and blame, reward and punishment, conscience and remorse, every enjoined command, every promulgated law, every advice asked for, every repentance expressed, every punishment inflicted, all these proclaim human liberty and show what is the true sentiment of the common people as well as that of the learned. Free agents alone can be led by commands or threatened with chastisement. Where can we find a man who does not act in one way with irresponsible children, the insane and others of like condition, and in quite a different manner with men in full possession of their reason? Who does not perfectly well understand that there is a great difference in the restraint or confinement applied to a criminal and that applied to an insane person? Whence this difference if not from free will? It is free will alone which in our eyes makes the former a guilty man, while the disorders committed by the other are attributed only to his misfortune.

The reader will find a complete demonstration of human liberty in Part II, to which he is referred.

Physical violence undoubtedly can prevent our *exterior actions,* but it has no power over the act of our will. "Our bodies are in your power," the Martyrs were wont to say to their persecutors, but you can do nothing to our souls." It is known that the Church has always maintained this free will against all contrary denials of it.

This truth is forcibly brought out by our Blessed Redeemer in those striking words of His Gospel (Luke 12, 4–5): *"I say to you, my friends, be not afraid of them, that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will show you whom you shall fear; fear ye Him, who after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell. Yea, I say to*

you fear Him." Hence, the persecuting tyrant may starve, may wound and kill the body, but the soul, its liberty, its existence are entirely beyond his reach.

161. 2. Man is in possession of *moral* liberty, when with respect to an action, no obligation is imposed *upon his will* to perform these actions or to omit them. *Moral* obligation consists in the necessity for man to conform his actions to the rules of morality, under pain of straying from his last end.

Man is physically free, as we have said, but does he also enjoy absolute moral liberty? Is there no obligation imposed upon the human will? Have we always the right to do those things which we can do through our natural powers? No man of sense would venture to maintain such a proposition.

Liberalism always confounds *psychological liberty or free will* with moral liberty. It is precisely because of this confusion of thought that Liberalism attributes to man *the natural right* to propagate error and evil, and considers modern liberties as something *absolutely and intrinsically good.* Man is free, says the Liberal doctrine; this liberty is a right of his nature; hence the State must respect this liberty and cause it to be respected. Man is physically free, nay, so free that no one, not even the State, can interfere with the inner action of his will, granted; but is he also *morally* free? Has he the right to abuse his liberty, and to propagate evil? If you maintain that man has such rights, then we ask you why does the State enact laws, establish tribunals, and build prisons? May it punish the exercise of a right? Is it lawful for the State to punish what it holds to be the legitimate right of citizens?

It is well, also, to remark the ambiguity that exists in the French verb *pouvoir,* "I can," for it is the double meaning of words which leads astray many minds and gives birth to many sophisms regarding liberty.

Here we have a practical application of the essential difference between the verbs *may* and *can.* I *may* not be allowed, on moral and legal grounds, to do what I *can* do by my physical power or strength. In other words, *physical* liberty is freedom from violence or physical coercion; *moral* liberty is

the absence of any prohibition from legitimate authority. We are all *physically* free to violate the laws of the country, at least as long as we are not held in duress but we are not free to do so *morally*, for we cannot transgress those laws without committing a wrong.

It is manifest, then, that *we cannot legitimately do*, that is without failing in a duty of conscience, all that we are capable of doing through our natural faculties. A son, for instance, has the *power* of plunging a dagger into the heart of his father; who would dare say he has the *right* to do so? There is, therefore, an essential difference between physical power and moral right. If this difference did not exist, we should have to admit the innocence of the most atrocious parricide; we should have to admit that the brigand who conceals himself in an ambush ready to attack the traveler on the highway has the right to assassinate his victim, because he has the power to do so. The foundation of the moral law or the obligation which imposes itself upon the human will, is the will of God, the Creator, the Sovereign Master of man and the Supreme Lawgiver. The atheist alone can proclaim the entire independence of man from the moral point of view; but can he prove that he is right in thinking so?

162. The essence or intimate nature of man's liberty consists in complete immunity from any impediments that may hinder him from tending to his last end, which is to do God's will by pursuing the path of rectitude, and thus securing his true happiness here and hereafter. Hence, the greater his control over inordinate tendencies and unruly passions, which are obstacles to the attainment of his end, the greater is the liberty he enjoys. And, on the contrary, whenever man fails to curb his irregular inclinations, dragging him to evil, he becomes their slave by yielding to their behests, instead of domineering over them. Thus the intemperate become the slaves of drink; the voluptuous the slaves of lust, the vindictive the slaves of anger, the misers the slaves of covetousness. All this is manifestly implied in our Savior's words, "*Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.*" (John 8, 34.) Hence, we easily understand why the Holy Ghost bestows

so high a eulogy on him who holds his passions within the bounds of reason and the injunctions of Divine Faith. *"The patient man is better than the valiant, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh cities."* (Prov. 16, 32.) As true liberty is freedom from everything that is wrong, or leads to wrong, such as error and sin, hence, our Blessed Savior said in His Gospel (John 8, 32), *"You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."* This salutary thought is clearly conveyed by the Apostle St. Paul, when he tells us that *"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."* (II Cor. 3, 17.)

A clear conception of man's liberty is evidently contained in those words of St. Paul (I Cor. 7, 37), *"He that hath determined, being steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but having power of his own will."* No one can question the importance of the doctrine of the freedom of the will. For if man be free, then he is accountable for his actions; be they good or evil, they are *his;* praise or blame, reward or punishment, which follow in their wake, are deserved and inevitably administered by the Supreme Judge, who will give to each according to his work, and from whose sentence there lies no appeal.

It is, therefore, absolutely wrong to say: Man is free, therefore he cannot be subject to any authority. The contrary is the truth. Man is free, therefore he is responsible for his acts and susceptible of obligations; he is free, but he is bound to make *legitimate use* of his freedom; he is free, but he should submit himself to God and to every power emanating from God. To pretend to free oneself from the necessary dominion of God over His creature, is insanity as well as ingratitude and a crime. On the contrary, for a man to recognize practically, in his moral life, private and public, his entire dependence upon Him who is at the same time infinite Wisdom, boundless Bounty and the Supreme Good, this is the glory and happiness of man, and his most imperative duty (vol. I, 305).

"True and desirable liberty in the individual order," says Leo XIII, "is that which does not leave man as a slave to error, or to passion, which are his worst enemies." "In a

society of men, liberty worthy of the name does not consist in doing as we may please, but in being able, with the help of civil laws, to live more easily in accord with the prescriptions of the eternal law." (Encycl. *Libertas Præstantissimum.*) It is in the same sense that Montesquieu (d. 1755) expresses himself: "Liberty can consist only in doing that which *we should* will." Unhappily "there is a great number of men, who, following the example of Lucifer, the author of the criminal cry: *I will not serve,* understand by the word liberty that which is simply nothing but pure and absurd license. Such are the men who belong to that school, so widely spread and so powerful, who, borrowing their name from that of liberty, wish to be called *Liberals.*" It is indeed evident that to act against the light of reason and Faith is to turn away from man's last end, to prepare one's own degradation and unhappiness; it is not using liberty, it is *abusing* it. That which shows the nobility of our being, is the power, with which our will is endowed, to choose the means enabling us to reach the final goal, in other words, *the power to do freely what is right* and, therefore, good.

163. 3. *Political* liberty is twofold. **a.** Applied to a nation, it consists in its independence in regard to other nations. It is manifest that the Church approves of this independence, because everywhere she inculcates upon her children the duty of showing efficaciously their love for their country, and when necessity requires it, of risking their lives to defend it against its enemies.

b. If applied to each *individual citizen,* it consists in the participation in a greater or less degree, directly or indirectly (through the right to vote), in the government of one's country. This political liberty naturally differs according to the form of government; evidently it is not the same in an absolute monarchy, or in a monarchy tempered by the aristocratic element, as in a constitutional monarchy or a republic.

Provided the sacred rights of religion be respected, the Church is indifferent concerning these several forms of government. She accommodates herself to all, because she can save souls as easily in the republic of Ecuador under García

Moreno as in a Christian monarchy. Consequently, provided a legitimate Government allows the Church freely to accomplish her mission, without encroaching upon any of her rights, she will in no way prevent it from following its own mission, which is to secure the temporal welfare of the people.

164. 4. *Social* or *civil* liberty, which is also called individual liberty, may be defined: the faculty of each citizen to exercise within the limits of right his personal activity, to provide for his private interests and those of his family, without hindrance on the part of his fellow-citizens or of the Government. It comprises the liberty of the person, of action, of property, of family, of the municipality, the right to fulfill the duties of charity, to found associations for some worthy purpose, etc.

Undoubtedly political liberty is a good and desirable thing, but the so-called Liberals of our day, whose tendency, when they are in power, is to arrive at *universal centralization,* to invade the sacred rights of individuals, families, and private societies, and to endeavor to make people believe that true liberty for individuals resides in the exercise of electoral rights. But what benefit is it to me to enjoy to a certain extent political liberty, that is, to have by my vote a hundredth or a thousandth part of the influence exercised in public affairs if the Government which I may have helped to establish does, by its tyrannical laws and merciless bureaucracy, interfere in countless ways with my activity, pretend to regulate capriciously my own individual acts, and shackle my freedom and my very life by the slavery of endless bureaucratic details?

The history of the present century, in which everyone is ever speaking of liberty, shows most clearly that oppression of true liberty and particularly of the liberty of *Catholic consciences* is the dream of all those who labor to overthrow the Church, in order to erect on her ruins a society purely naturalistic, without God, and, therefore, without faith, without hope, without love, and without any expectation of future life.

Facts the most striking attest how the Church has always

been favorable to civil liberty. Who, indeed, has laid throughout the world the foundations of true liberty and true equality, if not the Church? Is it not the Church, that amidst the frightful perversions of ideas and of morals, of both ancient and modern paganism, has successfully recalled to men the Christian principle that they are brethren, all equal before God? Is it not the Church that has imposed upon the governed as well as the governing classes the rigorous duty of justice and charity? Is it not the Church that by her teaching and institutions has secured the rehabilitation of woman, of the child, of the slave, of the poor, of the laborer, in a word, of all the unfortunates whose rights have been flagrantly usurped in a thousand ways, and trampled upon for centuries? (Part X.)

Authors Consulted in Part VII

Allies, T. W., "Church and State" (Burns and Oates, London).

Bagshawe, Rev. J. M., "The Credentials of the Catholic Church" (Burns and Oates, London).

Bottalla, Rev. Paul, S.J., "The Pope and the Church" (Burns and Oates, London).

Brownson, Orestes, Works, vols. VIII, XI, XII, XIII (Thorndike Nourse, Detroit).

Capel, Monsignor, "The Pope" (Pustet, New York).

Casey, Rev. P. H., S.J., "The Bible and Its Interpreter" (John J. McVey, Philadelphia).

Cox, Rev. Thomas E., "The Pillar and Ground of the Truth" (Hyland, Chicago).

Digby, Kenelm, "The Victories of Rome" (Kegan Paul, Trench, London).

Fessler, Dr. Joseph, "The True and The False Infallibility of the Popes" (Catholic Publication Society, New York).

Ferreira, Monsignor, "Apologetical History of the Popes. From St. Peter to Leo XIII." A Spanish standard work translated into several European Languages (Pietro Marietti, Turin).

Finlay, Rev. Peter, S.J., "The Church of Christ" (Longmans, Green, New York).

Hergenröther, Cardinal Joseph, "Anti-Janus, Criticism of Work 'The Pope and the Council' by Dr. J. Döllinger." "Catholic Church and Christian State" (Burns and Oates, London).

Leo XIII, Pope, "Encyclicals" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Lyons, Rev. Daniel, "Christianity and Infallibility, Both or Neither" (Longmans, Green, New York).

Manning, Cardinal Henry Edward, "The Independence of the Holy See" (Henry King and Co., London).

Millar, Rev. F. X., S.J., "The State and the Church," joint author with Rev. John A. Ryan (The Macmillan Co., New York).

McErlane, Rev. D., S.J., "The Church of Christ, the Same Forever" (Herder, St. Louis).

Merry del Val, Cardinal Raphael, "The Truth of Papal Claims" (Herder, St. Louis).

McLoughlin, Rev. John, "The Divine Plan of the Church" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Murphy, Count John Nicholas, "The Chair of Peter" (Burns and Oates, London).

Major, Henry, "Authority of the Holy Roman See" (Philadelphia, Printed for the author).

Monahan, Ambrose, "Triumphs of the Church in the Early Ages" (New York).

O'Reilly, Rev. Edmund, S.J., "The Relations of the Church to Society" (J. Hodges, London).

Porter, Most Rev. Archbishop, S.J., "The Supremacy of the Apostolic Church" (Burns and Oates, London).

Ryan, Rev. John A., "The State and the Church," joint author with Rev. F. X. Millar, S.J. (The Macmillan Co., New York).

Robison, Rev. William F., "Christ's Masterpiece" (Herder, St. Louis).

Scholfield, Rev. J. T., "Divine Authority" (Longmans, Green, New York).

Sarda y Salvany, "What Is Liberalism?" Edited by Condé B. Pallen (Herder, St. Louis).

Vaughan, Rt. Rev. John S., "The Purpose of the Papacy" (Herder, St. Louis).

Weninger, Rev. F. X., S.J., "Apostolical and Infallible Authority of the Pope" (Sadlier and Co., New York).

PART VIII

OF CERTAIN ACCUSATIONS BROUGHT AGAINST THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE INTOLERANCE OF THE CHURCH

165. Holy in her Founder, always pure in her doctrine and in her morality, the Church has never ceased to lead her members to the practice of the most beautiful and heroic virtues. Hence, in spite of human frailty and the violence of the passions, there always has been among Catholics a countless number of saints, apostles, martyrs, men of grand and noble character, incapable of baseness, ever ready to devote themselves to works of the highest perfection and most sublime charity.

But if man can and should make an honest use of his liberty, and carry on a courageous warfare against his vicious tendencies, it unfortunately happens but too often that he listens to their insidious voice. The grace of holy baptism, and even that of the priesthood, does not destroy in his heart the tendencies which incline to evil.

Should we, therefore, be surprised, if in the course of nineteen hundred years, we sometimes meet with faults or crimes committed by Catholics, or even by priests and bishops, forgetful of their duties?

In presence of these inevitable failings of our human nature what is the conduct of the enemies of Catholicism? In place of admiring the prodigies of virtue performed through supernatural grace, by a multitude of souls, despite of the sway of rebellious passions, they gather together with zealous care a few abuses and faults, which are met with in the long series of past centuries, and out of this material they

manufacture their weapons for attacking the Church; they cast up these charges unceasingly in the face of the Church, as if she were responsible for them. The world, regenerated by the Church, counts for nothing in their eyes, no more than the reprobation with which she has always rebuked and condemned everything contrary to the divine law; the crimes of a few baptized scoundrels form the great arsenal of the seekers after scandal. They are always compelled to return to the use of the same weapons, however blunted they may be. In season and out of season, they are always talking of the Inquisition, the persecution of Galileo, and of a few other facts. To forewarn the Faithful and vindicate the Church from these silly accusations, the apologist cannot dispense himself from the task of showing how groundless are these accusations. This we shall do in the chapters of this Part.

I. In What Sense Is the Catholic Church Intolerant?

166. If we take this word in its true sense, that is to say, as *dogmatic or doctrinal* intolerance, the Church is certainly intolerant, and she does not consider it necessary to defend herself against this pretended reproach. *Dogmatic intolerance* is an essential prerogative of the truth; it is a natural and inevitable consequence of the very existence of the Catholic religion, which we have proved to be the only true religion, the only religion obligatory on man, who cannot be bound to believe and accept anything but the truth. *Dogmatic tolerance,* on the contrary, is nothing but *religious indifference,* which refuses to acknowledge any religion as exclusively true and obligatory on all. To reproach the Church with doctrinal intolerance is to reproach her with possessing and preaching divine truth: now, the first and the greatest duty of truth is to exclude everything contrary to it. Besides, it is not only the true religion that is intolerant, but all human science also must be intolerant. What is there more intolerant than mathematics? By the very fact that she is certain of possessing the whole religious truth, the Church

must condemn every error contrary to it. Thus, as Bossuet writes: "The Catholic religion is the most severe and least tolerant of all religions as to dogmatic errors"; and Jules Simon, a contemporary philosopher of the naturalistic school, admits that "the lawfulness of ecclesiastical intolerance is entirely beyond discussion." (See in Part IX, Freedom of Thought.)

We acknowledge without any hesitation that, as to matters of dogma, all other religious societies separated from Rome are not intolerant. J. J. Rousseau has said of Protestantism: "The Protestant religion is unavoidably tolerant through its own principle; it is essentially tolerant, it is as tolerant as it may possibly be, because the only dogma that it does not tolerate is that of intolerance." Such praise, for any religious doctrine or creed, is the most crushing refutation that can be made of its tenets.

But if the Catholic Church is rightfully intolerant towards all false or evil *doctrines* and towards all *vices,* as truth and goodness must necessarily be, she is on the other hand full of indulgence and mercy *for wayward sinners.* Established to save men, she spares nothing to snatch the souls of men from eternal ruin. Always faithful to the mission received from Jesus Christ, she confined herself, in converting the world, to preaching the Gospel, that is to say, she always proceeded by the way of persuasion, without using any constraint, or any force. Like her Divine Master, she has, at all times, suffered persecution and shed her blood for the salvation of souls. If at times she considered it right to chastise *her own rebellious children,* she exercised a right that no one dreamed of denying, and she has exercised it in a maternal way, aiming principally at their conversion and at the removal of scandal. We will now see that it was not so with heretical sects or other enemies of the Church. (See "The Charity of the Church," by Cardinal Baluffi, ch. xxi, xxii.)

We must, unless bereft of our reason, be religiously or theologically intolerant and exclusively so, for toleration in the spiritual order is at the bottom neither more nor less than the denial of the religious principle, the uncompromising

immutability and consistency of truth. As good excludes evil, and right excludes wrong, so truth excludes error. Nothing in the universe tolerates its opposite; hence reason compels us to assert truth as essentially contrary to falsehood, and whoever asserts the one, necessarily denies the other. The principle on which the doctrinal intolerance of the Catholic Church is condemned is found to be ultimately based on a maxim familiar to unthinking people—One religion is as good as another. This is nothing less than religious indifferentism pure and simple, a theory radically opposed to divine Faith, and in open contradiction to the dictates of sound reason. The advocates of such a theory must practically admit that any Creed, whether divinely revealed or devised by man's fallible brain, is equally agreeable in the eyes of God, eternal, unchangeable Truth. On this account the voice of reason proclaims in tones, which cannot be mistaken, that the evident truth of a religion establishes the evident falsehood of that which is contradictory to it.

II. Protestant Intolerance

167. Strange inconsistency. The men who cast upon the Church the utterly undeserved reproach of intolerance are generally the very ones who are full of good-will towards Protestantism. Is this because in Protestantism they have met with true tolerance, approved by sound reason? Let us question history as written by Protestants themselves and we will see, as Menzel, himself a Protestant, says, that "where Protestantism prevailed, there also prevailed intolerance."

168. 1. The first founder of Protestantism, whom his friends would wish to set up as a model apostle of tolerance and emancipator of free thought, though he himself went so far as to deny the existence of free-will in man, Luther, openly commanded his followers "to win heaven by the might of the sword, to raise themselves up to God upon mountainous piles of corpses." His war cry was: "Long live the Bible! Death to Papists." "It is necessary that every one should rush forth against the Pope, and kill him, with all who are

around him and siding with him, emperors, kings, princes and nobles." "We must wash our hands in their blood." This diabolical purpose the audacious innovator has often declared in his writings.

These provocations to a general massacre, constantly repeated, produced but too often their dire effects. The Peasants' War, in whose origin and course the apostate monk had so large a part, is well known (A.D. 1525). As long as the ravages and cruelties of these wars were perpetrated in Catholic countries, the Reformer approved of the doings of those reckless hordes of assassins; but when he saw them, under the leadership of Münzer, invading the countries where the Reformation had been established, he set about exciting the Protestant princes against them. "Now, my princes," he cried, "to arms! to arms! Strike, drive your swords into them, kill from the front and from the rear, for there is nothing more diabolical than a seditious man; he is a dog who will rend you to pieces unless you kill him." "It is not only your right," he used to say to the Protestant princes, "it is your duty to establish the pure Gospel, to protect the new Churches, to destroy the authority of the Pope, and to allow no strange doctrine to spread itself." "Admirable times," he exclaims on another occasion, "when princes can more easily merit heaven by massacring peasants and shedding blood, than others by saying prayers before God! Every peasant struck by death is lost body and soul, and belongs to the devil for all eternity." More than one hundred thousand of these unfortunate creatures perished in these wars, and Luther gloried in these horrible massacres. "It is I," he cried out, "who shed this blood by order of God."

This was the cold cruelty that overflowed in the soul of the Reformation leader. The pillage of churches and monasteries, the robbery of ecclesiastical property, armed revolt, the massacre of whole populations, a thirty years' war, which buried everything in blood and ruins, these are the great deeds by which Protestantism signalized its birth in Germany.

169. 2. What occurred in Switzerland? Calvin, the most infamous and cruel of tyrants, wrote an entire book to show

that heretics should be put to death. Adding examples to precept, he caused Michael Servetus to be burnt alive for the crime of heresy, and attended the execution in person. If Valentine Gentilis escaped at Geneva the fate of Servetus, it was owing to the retraction of his doctrines. Even that did not save him; as shortly after he was beheaded at Berne for denying the mystery of the Holy Trinity. Jacques Gruet, tortured until his last breath; Antoni, Funch, Bolsec, Castalion, Ochino, Acioti, and a hundred others paid with their lives for their religious opinions and especially, the tyrant said, for the unpardonable audacity of having blamed the Reformers. To abstain from the services of the new worship, such as the sermon or the communion, constituted the crime of high treason and was punished accordingly. They made a crime even of thought, desire, the tendencies and inclinations of the heart. "Calvin," says Mr. Galiffe, a Protestant writer of Geneva, "established a reign of the most ferocious intolerance, the grossest superstitions, the most impious dogmas. . . . He prevailed at first by cunning, then by violence. . . . That soul of mud craved for blood." This same man desired that the Anabaptists should be treated as brigands. "In the legislation conceived by this monster," says Audin, "we hear only these words: Death and blood everywhere! The scaffold or the funeral pile punished every resistance." All these cruelties were perpetrated because he defended the thesis "Jure gladii coercendos esse hæreticos" (Heretics must be controlled by the right of the sword). As to the historical truth of these facts the reader will find details and proofs in Audin's book, entitled "*Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin*" (History of the life, works and doctrine of Calvin); see also "*Vie de Mme. de Maintenon*" (Life of Madam de Maintenon) by de Noailles.

Zwinglius was not in the least of a milder temper. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to read his letter of May 4, 1525, to Ambrose Blaurer, cited by Janssen, in "*Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker.*" He there declares that it is permissible to massacre priests, if that be necessary to arrive at the abolition of images and of the Mass.

170. 3. The same revolting spectacle is seen in France. There also the Huguenot Calvinists aroused the furies of civil war; they pillaged Orléans, Pithiviers, Nîmes, Auxerre, Bourges, Montpellier, entire provinces, indeed, massacring the inhabitants, destroying the churches found in their way, casting into the rivers or hanging the priests and monks who fell into their hands. At Orthés, it is the entire population, numbering three thousand Catholics, who fall under their swords. In the single year of 1562, according to their own admission, they put to death 4000 priests and religious, devastated 20,000 churches and 90 hospitals. "Who does not know," says Bossuet, "the deeds of violence which the Queen of Navarre perpetrated upon priests and religious? People still show the towers from which Catholics were precipitated and the precipices into which they were cast." "*Histoire des variations des églises protestantes*" (History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches), vol. II, book X.

171. 4. Intolerance was also rampant *in Denmark,* where Lutheranism was introduced under Christian II, surnamed the Nero of the North. Under Frederic I, successor of this prince, these horrors against members of religious orders were carried so far that the Protestant historian Mallet, "*Histoire de Danemarck*" (History of Denmark), vol. VI, could not refrain from saying, "In no country where the Reformation was established, did the monks suffer more cruelly than in Denmark." It was death to all Catholic priests and death to every man who afforded them a refuge. In Sweden, which became Lutheran under Gustavus Vasa, the cruelty of this prince toward Catholics was so terrible and the massacres so frightful that Luther himself was indignant at them.

172. 5. The history of the Schism, originated in England in the passions of a debauched king, shows that Henry VIII condemned to the scaffold two queens, two cardinals, twenty archbishops and bishops, more than five hundred abbots, priors and monks, a multitude of learned men, dukes, earls and gentlemen, among whom was the celebrated Bl. Thomas More, and finally over seventy-two thousand Catholics of every rank. "I would wish to efface from our annals," says

the Anglican Fitz-William, author of the "*Letters of Atticus,*" "every trace of the long series of iniquities which accompanied the Reformation in England. Injustice and oppression, murder, rapine, and sacrilege are indelibly recorded in the history of those days. Such were the means by which the inexorable and sanguinary tyrant, Henry VIII, the founder of our religion, established the supremacy of his new Church. All who wished to preserve the religion of their fathers and remain attached to the authority, which he himself had taught them to revere, were treated as rebels and soon became his victims." It is particularly during the reign of the *Virgin Queen, good Queen Bess,* as Englishmen used to call her (A.D. 1559–1603), that persecution against the Catholics assumed a most barbarous and cruel character. This bastard daughter of Henry VIII and Anna Boleyn, a mere concubine, put to death as many Catholics as her father; she wantonly committed atrocities which horrified the world and which surpassed in cruelty even those of pagan antiquity. In Ireland she perpetrated massacres so dreadful that, according to the Protestant Leland, "there were left to be governed by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, so to say, nothing but ashes and corpses."

"Historians have been divided in opinion as to which was the worst man that England ever produced, her father, Henry VIII, or Cranmer; but all mankind must agree that this was the worst woman that ever existed in England or in the whole world, Jezebel herself not excepted." (William Cobbett, "History of the Reformation." Letter XI, n. 348.)

We here subjoin a list of some of the penal laws in force against Catholics, from the times of the English Reformation, 1535, up to the outbreak of the Gordon Riots in the year 1779, nearly 250 long years of tyrannical persecution. Historians will seek in vain for similar examples of religious intolerance in any Catholic nation from the beginning of the Christian Era even to our own times.

(1) No Catholic nobleman might sit in the House of Lords.

(2) No Catholic gentleman might sit in the House of Commons.

(3) No Catholic might vote at elections.

(4) A Catholic had to pay double taxes, unless he turned Protestant.

(5) No Catholic might hold any public office.

(6) No Catholic might present to any living in the Established Church, though Jews were allowed to do so.

(7) Catholics who stayed away from Protestant worship were fined £20 a month.

(8) No Catholic might keep arms for self-defence, nor bring a lawsuit, nor be guardian, nor an executor, nor a lawyer, nor a doctor, nor travel five miles from his house: all under heavy penalties.

(9) A Catholic woman, married to a Protestant, forfeited two-thirds of her dowry, unless she attended her husband's Church, and she was liable to imprisonment at any time, unless ransomed by her husband at £10 a month.

(10) Any four magistrates might compel a Catholic convicted of not attending Protestant worship to turn Protestant, on penalty of banishment out of England for life. If he dared to return, he was to be hanged.

(11) Any two magistrates might at any time summon any Catholic over sixteen; should he refuse to turn Protestant, and persist for six months in his refusal, he was declared incapable of possessing land, and his lands were confiscated to the nearest Protestant heir.

(12) No such Catholic might buy land, and all contracts made by him were null and void.

(13) Any Catholic who employed a Catholic schoolmaster in his family, was fined £10 a month, besides £2 a day on account of the school-master.

(14) Any Catholic who sent his child to a Catholic school abroad, was fined £100, and the child was disqualified from inheriting, from buying, and from holding any property whatsoever.

(15) Any priest who was convicted of saying Mass was fined £120; any one convicted of hearing Mass was fined £60.

(16) Any priest who came from abroad and did not turn Protestant within three days, was liable to be hanged, drawn, and quartered.

(17) Any one who became a Catholic, or induced another

to become a Catholic, was liable to be hanged, drawn, and quartered.

Such were the penal laws enacted and enforced against Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland for their adherence to the ancient Faith. All attempts on the part of some more humane English Monarchs to mitigate that iniquitous and cruel legislation, proved powerless against the overwhelming multitude of fanatical bigots and of many Protestant divines, their despotic leaders. Thus James II lost the crown of his three kingdoms for an edict, which, as it tolerated Catholics, was denounced as an act of treason and a most outrageous tyranny. The penal laws against Catholics were in a great measure adopted by the Episcopalian colony of Virginia, who brought with them to America the policy of intolerance. The same regime of religious fanaticism against everything Roman prevailed in the puritan colony of Massachusetts, which made it an offense punishable with banishment to harbor a Catholic priest for a single night, or to give the priest a single meal. By way of contrast let us here recall a significant historical fact. The contention that the true spirit of Catholicism makes for liberty and tolerance received a classic illustration, as is well known, when Maryland, under the Catholic Lord Baltimore, passed the first toleration act in this country. As George Bancroft relates (History of the United States, Vol. I, p. 252), "Maryland at that day was unsurpassed for happiness and liberty: Conscience was without restraint; a mild and liberal proprietary conceded every measure which the welfare of the colony required; domestic union, a happy concert between all branches of Government, an increasing emigration, a productive commerce, a fertile soil, which Heaven had richly favored with rivers and deep bays, united to perfect the scene of colonial felicity and contentment." And when the Puritans were driven out by Anglicans from the colony of Virginia, Lord Baltimore invited them to emigrate to Maryland, offering them lands, privileges and free liberty of Religion, and they were welcomed and received with the greatest kindness. But Maryland did not know that she was fostering in her bosom a vindictive,

ungrateful viper. The refugees soon rose in revolt against her colonial Government and substituted for the toleration act the following provision, 'That none, who profess and exercise the Papistic, commonly known as the Roman Catholic Religion, can be protected in this province.' '' As the above-quoted historian remarks (p. 251), ''The puritans had neither the gratitude to respect the rights of the Government, by which they had been received and fostered, nor magnanimity to continue the toleration, to which alone they were indebted for their residence in the colony. An act concerning religion confirmed the freedom of Conscience, provided the liberty were not extended to 'popery.' ''

173. 6. No one can read without a shudder what the historian Kerroux relates, in volume II of his *''Abregé de l'histoire de la Hollande''* (Abridgment of the History of Holland), about the atrocious tortures which Catholics had to suffer in the *Low Countries*. He writes: ''These were some among the torments that those eminent victims, the Catholics, had to suffer at the hands of the Dutch Calvinists. Their dislocated members, their bodies torn with scourges were wrapped in stuffs steeped in spirits, and set on fire, till the skin became shrunken and black, almost charred, and the muscles in many parts were laid bare. Sometimes burning sulphur and lighted torches were applied to the arm-pits and the soles of the feet. When thus tortured, they were exposed for several nights on the bare ground, without covering, and beaten at intervals with clubs to prevent them from having any sleep. They were given for food some wretched salt fish and salt meat, that they might suffer from thirst, and be refused, at their most earnest entreaties, a single cup of water. Hornets were placed on their stomachs, and their stings were left in the punctures. Sonoi, the Protestant governor of Friesland, sent a quantity of rats to that dread tribunal set up by Calvin, which were placed on the bodies of the Catholics, and provoked by the application of fire to gnaw the flesh and eat into the vitals of the dying Martyrs.'' It is well known that in the Provinces of Brabant and Flanders alone, the ''Beggars,'' *''Les Gueux,''* fanatic heretics of the blackest

dye, overthrew in less than five days more than four hundred churches and cathedrals; that they committed against priests, religious and the Catholic people, atrocities which would be deemed impossible if the most unexceptional historical documents were not in existence to prove the dreadful truth of these accounts.

This was everywhere the conduct of Protestants towards those who wished to remain faithful to the ancient religion of their fathers. And, we must not forget, the reformers proclaimed as a fundamental dogma of the new religion *free inquiry* into the Sacred Scriptures, that is to say, *the right to believe what any one pleased!*

174. Here we add only three other Protestant testimonies. Hallam in his "Constitutional History" writes as follows: "Persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed churches; that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive." Miss Strickland in her "Queens of England" says that "there was not a sect of the Reformation that did not avow, as part of their religious duty, the horrible necessity of destroying some of their fellow creatures (mostly by burning them alive), on account of what they severally termed heretical tenets." A fit conclusion to these avowals is found in Luther's ukase when he ordered his followers "to wash their hands in the blood of Popes."

In dealing with this subject of the comparative severity and intolerance between Catholics on one side and Protestants on the other, we may dwell a little longer on this topic, and hear the opinion of Mr. Lecky, a writer not only not friendly, but even hostile to the Catholic Church. In his work entitled "Rationalism in Europe" (vol. I, p. 51, edit. 1870), he thus contrasts Catholic and Protestant intolerance:

"Catholicism was an ancient Church. She had gained a great part of her influence by vast services to mankind. She rested avowedly on the principle of authority. She was defending herself against aggression and innovation. . . . She might point to the priceless blessings she had bestowed upon humanity, to the slavery she had destroyed, to the civilization

she had founded, to the many generations she had led with honor to the grave. She might show how completely her doctrines were interwoven with the whole social system, how fearful would be the convulsion if they were destroyed, and how absolutely incompatible they were with the acknowledgment of private judgment.

"But what shall we say of a Church that was but a thing of yesterday, a Church that had as yet no services to show, no claims upon the gratitude of mankind; a Church that was by profession the creature of private judgment, and was in reality generated by the intrigues of a corrupt court, which, nevertheless, suppressed by force a worship that multitudes deemed necessary to their salvation; and by all her organs and with all her energies persecuted those who clung to the religion of their fathers? What shall we say of a religion which comprised at most but a fourth part of the Christian world, and which the first explosion of private judgment shivered into countless sects, which was, nevertheless, so pervaded by the spirit of dogmatism that each of these sects asserted its destructive doctrines with the same confidence and persecuted with the same unhesitating violence, as a Church that was venerable with the homage of sixteen centuries? . . . So strong and so general was its intolerance, that for some time it was, I believe, truly said that there were more instances of partial toleration being advocated by Roman Catholics than by orthodox Protestants."

Our opponents, to justify their accusation of intolerance against the Catholic Church, are wont to refer to the Syllabus issued by Pius IX in the year 1867. This celebrated Syllabus, that is, a catalogue of 80 propositions condemned by that Supreme Pontiff, has received more adverse criticism than almost any other Document emanated from the Holy See in modern times. The charge, however, of intolerance can justly be retorted and laid to the Civil State which would be ready to adopt and enforce the policy contained in the nineteenth and thirty-ninth propositions condemned by the Pope. They read as follows: "The Church is not a true, perfect and wholly independent society, possessing its own unchanging

rights conferred upon it by its Divine Founder; but it is for the civil power to determine what are the rights of the Church, and the limits, within which it may use them. The State, as the origin and source of all rights, enjoys a right that is unlimited.'' These are fair samples of the proscribed doctrines. The principles expressed in these propositions are fatal to the rights and welfare not only of the Church but of every other organization which citizens may adopt. If the civil power may justly determine the rights and activities of the Church, and assign their limits, it may with greater reason exercise the same control over all purely secular societies. This is tyranny and intolerant absolutism, and a bold enunciation of the Doctrine of the Omnipotence of the State and Despotic Cæsarism. It asserts in effect that neither individual citizens nor their associations have any right which the State is bound to respect. The civil government may do what it pleases with the liberty, the property and lives of its subjects. (See State and Church listed at the end of Part VII.) This is a truly monstrous doctrine, which if once adopted and enforced in this country, would set at nought the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. The well-known slogan ''The land of the free and the home of the brave'' would then be replaced by this other more true, ''The land of the tyrants, and the home of the slaves.''

III. Intolerance of the Other Enemies of the Church

175. The philosophy of the XVIIIth century has not proven itself any more merciful or tolerant than Protestantism. J. J. Rousseau, the same author who so energetically condemned the dogma of intolerance, and who maintained that *not a particle of truth* could be found in any positive religion, does not hesitate to say that governments can *establish by law* a State religion, consequently a positive religion, and enforce its practice even under pain of death! ''It is for the sovereign,'' he says in his book *''Contrat Social''* (the Social Contract) ''to determine the articles of this religion.''

Then he adds these words, where cruelty vies with impudence: "Not being able to oblige any one to believe in the articles of a State religion, the sovereign may, nevertheless, banish from his dominion any one who does not believe them, not as an impious man but as a dishonest member of society. . . . If any one, who has publicly acknowledged these dogmas, should act as if he did not believe them, *let him be punished with death!* He has committed the greatest of crimes, he has lied before the law." And yet, according to Rousseau, no one can be compelled to believe! Can anything be conceived more absurd, more incoherent than this? Here is, indeed, logic with a vengeance.

This intolerance of the sophist of Geneva is the same as that of certain so-called *humanitarian philosophers of our times.* There are some who go so far as to express regret that in 1793 the French revolutionists were wanting *in audacity;* they only wait, they say, for an occasion to have recourse to brutal force against Catholicism, in order to render its exercise *absolutely impossible and to stifle it in the mud.*

176. Remark. It is true there have been Catholic rulers who, through excess of ill-regulated zeal, have had recourse to violence in order to convert infidels and sectaries; but in this they followed *their own personal impulses* and not the rules of the Church. The Church does not admit of this kind of apostolate, and the responsibility of what she condemns cannot be cast upon her. It is quite otherwise as to Protestantism and infidel philosophy. Here it was the founders of the Reformation themselves, it was the leaders of philosophism, who gave the signal and the example of the most atrocious intolerance. And yet, most remarkable circumstance, we do not hear the enemies of the Church condemning these atrocities. On the contrary, all countries where Catholics are still oppressed receive from them praise and encouragement, and they find in this intolerant conduct *examples worthy of imitation.* Is not this the height of injustice, partiality and inconsistency?

CHAPTER II

OF THE MAXIM: OUT OF THE CHURCH THERE IS NO SALVATION

177. But at least, it will be said, the Catholic Church cannot exculpate herself from the reproach of intolerance and cruelty, because she proclaims that there is no salvation for those who die outside of her communion. How many are thus condemned by her to eternal damnation, solely because they do not belong to the Church of Rome! We have already given some answer to this difficulty. We consider it well, however, to enlarge somewhat more upon what we have said upon the subject. We will see if the old man whom J. J. Rousseau introduces in his book, and over whose fate he sheds tears, deserves all this sympathy.

Among those who attack the Church because of this maxim, the Protestants are the most conspicuous. Now this principle, with which they reproach the Church, is a logical consequence of the doctrine of their principal leaders themselves. They are, therefore, contradicting themselves. What right have they to bring up against us that very charge, which they must themselves admit to be contained in their own creed, and which is directly expressed in the formularies of faith drawn up in the first period of Protestantism? Here, for instance, is what we read in the Helvetic (Swiss) Confessions of 1565. "There is no salvation outside of the Church, as there was no salvation outside of the Ark; if man desires life, he must not separate himself from the true Church of Jesus Christ." The Saxon Confession, and that of Scotland, are no less explicit: "Outside of the Church," says the Calvinist Catechism of the XVIIth century, "there is nothing but damnation; all those who separate themselves from the communion of the Faithful, to form a sect apart, cannot hope for salvation as long as they remain separated." Moreover, Calvin himself affirms, in his *Institutions*, "that outside of the Church man cannot hope for the pardon of sins nor for salvation." (See Gousset), *"L'Eglise"* (The Church).

The Catholic maxim is but a perfectly *reasonable* conclusion from what we have hitherto demonstrated. If the true religion, that of Jesus Christ, is *obligatory* for salvation, and if this religon is exclusively that of the Church of Rome, as it has been proved numberless times, it must be admitted that outside of *that* Church there is no salvation; in other words, no man is saved unless he belongs to it in some manner. It is not, therefore, the Church that should be reproached with upholding this maxim; if any reproach may reasonably be made against any one, it is against its *Divine Founder Himself,* who has made His religion obligatory upon man.

But to realize the perfect justice and reasonableness of this maxim, it suffices to understand fully *the sense and extent* of its meaning, viz., to know what, according to Catholic doctrine, is necessary in order to have the right to heaven.

178. Let us at the beginning listen to a grave authority, Cardinal Deschamps, who says: "In this phrase: *Outside of the Church there is no salvation,* as in every penal law there is understood one word which, though not expressed, is easily supplied, it is the word *voluntarily,* for the reason that every penal law presupposes *guilt,* and that guilt, in its turn, presupposes two conditions: *the fact and the intention.* To the question then: Does the Church believe in the loss of those who, being born and brought up where they could not know the Church, who are in invincible ignorance of the law of Jesus Christ, but have faithfully practiced all the good that they knew: the answer must be: No. This means that no one is lost except through his own fault."

The one true Religion, the guide to man's eternal salvation, is necessarily that which God Himself has revealed and prescribed. Its latest phase and most perfect development is Christianity, the uncompromising antithesis of Paganism, Mohammedanism and Judaism. It has been proved by countless apologists that historical Christianity is identical with Catholicism, a truth which no adversary has as yet been able to disprove. Hence the Latin saying: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* can only mean "outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation." Even our adversaries have thus understood it,

and made it a charge of intolerance against the Catholic Church alone. We must therefore exclude the ultra liberal and utterly false and unwarrantable interpretation given by the so-called latitudinarians, who would have us understand that maxim as meaning that to be saved one must be incorporated into some Church, no matter which. This novel view is equivalent to advocating doctrinal tolerance, which has been shown to be untenable and absurd (n. 166). This may offend, among others, the broadminded Anglican parsons; but we do not hesitate to avow it, for no severer sentence can be pronounced against any Church than that it fears to assert its own indispensableness to salvation. A Church that concedes the possibility of salvation in another creed, that is, outside of itself, confesses, by that very fact, that it is not itself the one true Church of God; and that it is therefore a false Church unacceptable to the Lord, whom it cannot claim as its Founder, and which cannot consequently save. It is gratifying to know that the doctrine expressed above is in perfect accord with the teaching of the Supreme Pontiff Pius IX in his Allocution of December 9, 1854, and in his Encyclical Letter of August 11, 1863.

"We must hold as certain that ignorance of the true Religion, when it is invincible, excuses from all fault in the sight of the Lord. Everyone knows that those who are afflicted by an invincible ignorance in regard to our Holy Religion, but that faithfully observe the natural law, the precepts of which have been engraved by God on the hearts of all men, and who, being ready to obey God, actually lead a good and upright life, such individuals can, by the action of the Divine light, and the power of grace, elicit acts of Faith and attain to eternal life. God, in fact, who sees the inmost recesses and secrets, the minds, the thoughts and dispositions of all, will not, in His goodness and sovereign clemency suffer anyone to incur everlasting punishment who is not guilty of a voluntary grievous offence."

Moreover, the theological axiom already mentioned: "To him who does what is in his power, God does not refuse *grace*," is perfectly applicable to the present question. He who has

followed the light of reason and lived conformably to what he believed to be the truth, cannot be condemned. "A man," says the same Cardinal, "may *in his heart* belong to the Church without belonging to her as to her external relations. Is it not evident that every man of good faith belongs to the Church in his heart, because he would enter the Church if it were known to him that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ? Is not this the case with all men who have a sincere and general desire to adhere to the truth, to do the will of God? In other words, it is in their case a question of baptism of desire, *implicitly and sufficiently contained in the general intention,* as St. Thomas says, of making use of the means of salvation granted to men by Divine Providence. The persons, therefore, who are disposed to throw themselves into the arms of their Mother the Church, if they knew her, are, already, in the eyes of God, considered as her children, and *will infallibly receive from God the light necessary for salvation.* Jesus Christ died for all men, and the graces granted through this victim, the Lamb, which Eternal Justice had seen from the very beginning of time immolated for the salvation of mankind, *occisus ab origine mundi* (Apoc. 13, 8), have flowed forth upon all men without any exception. 'Christ,' as the Gospel assures us (John 1, 9), *'is the true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.'* Hence, no man is excluded from the benefits of redemption *except through his own fault,* and by his obstinate resistance to grace, and every man will be judged according to the graces or means of salvation which he may have received. Can there be a doctrine more merciful and at the same time more terrible; more merciful to those unfortunates who are blind to the truth but whose ignorance is not of a guilty character; and more terrible for the ingrates, who, to escape from the light that surrounds them, go seeking in the midst of *darkness* for reasons against the justice of God?"

179. As to children who die without baptism, and the same thing must be said of adults *who have never enjoyed the use of reason,* this is to be their destiny. They will enjoy that natural happiness, which would have been ours, if we had

not been raised to the supernatural state, and they will only be deprived of the *degree* of happiness resulting from the intuitive vision of God; a purely gratuitous gift which was due to no man.

A great many theologians assign to original sin, as its proper penalty, the privation only of supernatural happiness (the vision of God), a felicity which, at all events, is not due to human nature. St. Thomas maintains that children dying without baptism not only do not suffer the pain of *sense,* but that they do not suffer any sadness from the pain of *loss,* that is, from the privation of the beatific vision. . . . Theologians of credit admit that the children will enjoy natural happiness, more or less perfect: *Naturali beatitudine fruentur.*

All theologians make a distinction between negative infidelity and positive infidelity. *Negative* infidelity is not a sin. It is that of persons who do not believe in divine revelation, because they are ignorant of it without their fault. *Positive* infidelity, on the contrary, is a sin, and it is attributed to those to whom revelation has been sufficiently proposed and made known. These will certainly be condemned to the pain of loss as well as to that of sense, because they are guilty of the actual sin of positive infidelity. Muzzarelli, "*Du salut des païens*" (The salvation of pagans).

We add that baptism by water, being indispensable for salvation for all who know of its necessity and who can receive it, may, however, be replaced in exceptional cases *by the baptism of blood* and *by the baptism of desire.* Baptism of blood is equivalent to that of water as to the spiritual regeneration, and replaces it for those who have not as yet received the use of reason, when they are put to death for the cause of Jesus Christ. This is why the Church celebrates the feast of the Holy Innocents, massacred by King Herod. Baptism of desire replaces baptism by water for those who, knowing the necessity of the latter and being unable to receive it for some reason or other, have the explicit desire to receive it, accompanied by perfect contrition for any grievous sins which they may have committed. If, however, the danger of death ceases,

the reception of the ordinary baptism of water becomes imperative.

180. Let us also quote here a few words from a judicious writer, the Abbé Ant. Pirenne, in his "*Etudes philosophiques sur les principales questions de la religion revélée*" (Philosophical studies of the principal questions of Revealed Religion). "Let us suppose that someone, who is not a Christian (and it is the same as to heretics and schismatics), dies loving God for Himself, viz., for His sake and above all things, he is saved by that very fact. For with supernatural charity he has everything. Charity effaces all his sins. (Proverbs 10, 12.) And observe, that *the smallest* degree of charity is sufficient, for the essence of a virtue does not consist in its *intensity;* a drop of water is water as well as the whole ocean, and the quantity of a thing does not affect *its nature.* Thus charity sufficient for justification exists even with some attachment to venial sin; and without any sensible devotion. You are, therefore, saved, provided you quit this life loving God *for Himself and above everything* which might draw you to the commission of mortal sin. You are saved whatever be the circumstances in which you may be placed. If at the supreme moment, whether you be a pagan, heretic, or sinner, you receive from God the gift of charity, even in a very slight degree which does not take from you the affection to venial sin, you have enough for salvation, for charity makes contrition *perfect;* and charity and perfect contrition comprise at least implicitly the desire for the sacraments of baptism and confession, if they could be received."

If we wish to know by what means charity is communicated to the Faithful, here is the answer given by Leibnitz, borrowed from Catholic theologians: "God will give what is necessary for salvation to all men who do what humanly depends upon them, even though a miracle were required."

181. To recapitulate: among infidels, heretics and schismatics, the Catholic doctrine excludes from salvation for not having embraced the true Faith only those who have not known revealed truth because they did not *wish* to know it,

and those who, knowing it sufficiently, have *refused* to embrace it. Those alone are *de facto* bound to enter the Church who know the Church to be the necessary means of salvation. The formula "out of the Church there is no salvation" is, therefore, every way reasonable and logical; and if it be made a matter of reproach, it is either through error or bad faith; through error, if its precise and correct sense be not known; through bad faith, if there be a refusal to acknowledge it when it is known.

We are now prepared to draw from the principles stated some practical conclusions concerning the eternal salvation of validly baptized Protestants and of un-baptized non-Catholics.

If a man is in *invincible* ignorance of the true Faith, and yet observes the moral law, will he be lost? I answer that such a man will die in the Catholic Church. Either in his life, or at the moment of his death, the Providence of God will give him the means, *extraordinary* means if necessary, to know the true Faith, as far at least as is indispensably necessary for salvation. We must here distinguish between two classes of persons, the baptized and the unbaptized. As this is a subject but little understood, and seldom well explained, particular attention is asked to the following remarks:

182. With regard to persons born in Protestant countries and validly baptized, who, from want of instruction and opportunity, have never come to the knowledge that the Catholic Church is the only true Church of Christ, if they have never committed a mortal sin, or have atoned for their sins by perfect contrition, united to a sincere desire of doing all that God may require of them, they will be saved in the ordinary way, as members of the Catholic Church. Such persons are in reality Catholics; they have entered the Church by valid baptism, and are only outwardly separated from her communion by *inculpable* error. According to Catholic doctrine there is but one baptism; it is always valid, whether administered by a Christian, Jew, infidel, or heathen, provided it is conferred with the rites established by Christ and with the intention of conferring what Christ has instituted; every man who is thus

baptized becomes, at the moment of his baptism, a member of the Catholic Church. In some countries there are large numbers of Protestants validly baptized who are *invincibly* ignorant of the true Church; they are members of the Catholic Church, and, without knowing it, die in the Catholic communion. All who are validly baptized remain Catholics, until they apostatize by a culpable adherence to an error against faith, or *culpably* neglect to inquire, when a well-founded suspicion of error arises in their mind. Hence the hope that great numbers of Protestants may thus be saved, not indeed as *Protestants,* but as *members of the Catholic Church,* the only true Church of Christ.

183. The case of other non-Catholics, but unbaptized, differs considerably from that of baptized Protestants. Such persons, who are in error *inculpably,* observe the moral law as made known to them by the light of reason, and serve God to the best of their ability, according to the light which they possess, and are ready to do all that Heaven may desire from them, will certainly be saved. They may never receive the baptism of water, but for them what is called in the Catholic Church the baptism of desire, is sufficient. Their efforts to please God include the desire to know the true Faith, and willingness to embrace it; and as to sanctifying grace, which is also necessary for salvation, God, who is unwilling that men should perish, when they do their utmost to please Him, infuses into their souls, in the course of their lives, or at the moment of their death, the same sanctifying grace that is conferred by the baptism of water. If they fall into mortal sin, they may receive the grace to elicit an act of perfect contrition, and thereby obtain forgiveness. Their salvation is not according to the *ordinary* course of Providence, but the result of an *extraordinary* grace, conferred in view of the merits of Christ. By the baptism of desire they become members of the true Church of Christ, the Catholic Church, and are saved only as members of her communion.

In other words, there is only one way to heaven, but there are several ways that lead to the Catholic Church, its gate, for, besides the baptism of water, there is the baptism of blood,

or martyrdom suffered by an unbaptized person for the Faith of Christ, and the baptism of desire, of which we have just spoken. As to the question how many are saved by the baptism of desire, it is a secret known to God alone, whose boundless mercy extends to every human soul, and who never allows anyone to perish except through his own grievous fault. The Catholic Church says with St. Thomas Aquinas that if a man sincerely desires to know the truth, and observes the moral law to the best of his power, God, if necessary, will send an angel to enlighten him, and lead him into the Catholic Church, rather than allow him to perish. Thus we read in the Acts (10), that an angel was sent to the Centurion; and it is worthy of observation that the Centurion received the Holy Ghost, and therefore became a member of the Church, before he received the baptism of water.

184. But we must remember that all this holds true only in regard to those who are in *invincible* ignorance of the true Church. It does not by any means apply to that class of persons, which I fear is very numerous, who have an opportunity of knowing the truth, and wilfully neglect it; who close their eyes against the light, stifle the warnings of conscience, and live in sin; who refuse to examine the evidences of Catholic Faith for fear of being convinced of its truth, and, come what may, resolutely determine to die out of the Catholic Church. They do not wish to make the sacrifices which their conversion to the Catholic Church would require. They act like the Areopagites (Acts 17, 32), or Felix, the Roman Governor, who told St. Paul that they would hear him another time (Acts 24, 25); or like the Jews who stopped their ears, and stoned St. Stephen. They cannot claim that their ignorance is *invincible;* they sin against the Holy Ghost, and if they die in that condition, must be lost forever. (*"Catholicity, Protestantism, Infidelity,"* F. X. Weninger, S.J.)

185. As Fr. Russo remarks in his excellent book "The True Religion," if invincible ignorance may thus shield the non-Catholic Christian, why, it is asked, should Catholics do so much to induce him to change his religious belief? Why are they so desirous that he should become a member of the

Roman Church? It is *first*, because truth is infinitely better than error, however honestly the latter may be held. *Secondly*, because the good faith, which may exist in the sectarian, cannot be supposed to be present in every case, particularly with regard to persons of culture and the ministers of the Gospel, who have ample opportunities of studying the evidences of the Church of Christ. *Thirdly*, because, even when the good faith does exist, the soul may be stained with mortal sin. And how many may have such perfect contrition for their sins as to obtain forgiveness without the Sacrament of Penance? And how many do really know that true contrition is for non-Catholics *their only means* of reconciliation with God? *Fourthly*, because we desire that our separated brethren should realize and enjoy to the full extent during their life time the immense benefits our divine Savior has bestowed upon the Church for the salvation of man. *Fifthly*, because it is a sacred duty of God's minister to carry out the designs of the world's Redeemer, who founded *one* Church, and who wills that in His Church there should be but one flock, as there is but one Shepherd, His Vicar upon earth."

As to the members of Christian denominations separated from the Catholic Religion, we freely admit that, under the conditions laid down (n. 182) above, they may actually be saved. This is quite true, but it is equally certain that they will be saved not by means of Protestantism, but in spite of it. Protestantism as such has no saving power; hence, whoever is saved in that system, is saved not in so far as he is a Protestant, but in so far as he is a Catholic, though not knowing it. For a conservative, God-fearing Protestant, may retain and profess some purely Catholic doctrines, which may be the means of supernatural grace and eternal salvation to those who yield to their influence. Of course, we suppose in such an individual valid baptism and true, sufficient repentance of all grievous sins that may have been committed. But we must, at the same time, bear in mind the fact that genuine and distinctive Protestant doctrines can save nobody: nay, they can hinder and impede salvation, so long as they are wilfully adhered to. What are these genuine Protestant doc-

trines? They are such as the doctrine that Mass is a blasphemous superstition; that the Pope is not the successor of St. Peter, the head of the Church, the Vicar of Christ, but a usurper; that he has no prerogative of infallibility; that there are not seven sacraments, but only two; that Christ is not substantially present in Holy Eucharist; that there is no Purgatory; that the invocation of the Saints is contrary to Bible teaching; that the Scriptures need no authorized interpreter; that private judgment has supplanted the authority of the Catholic Church. Now these are distinctly Protestant doctrines, incapable of saving anyone, since they have been shown to be utterly false and pernicious, and as such cannot be employed by Almighty God as channels of grace and instruments of salvation.

CHAPTER III

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE

186. Among the charges laid at the door of Catholic controversialists by Protestant writers is that which gives the title to this chapter. They are accused of arguing in a circle in their demonstration of the truth of the Catholic religion, because, it is said, they prove the infallible authority of the Church by the Scriptures, and then prove the divine inspiration of the Scriptures by the infallible authority of the Church. This objection was made originally by Dr. Stillingfleet (d. 1699), an Anglican bishop, and then repeated in nearly all the Protestant works. It has been completely refuted by Catholic theologians, whose answer is thus briefly summed up by Dr. Brownson, vol. V, p. 235: "We beg leave to say to the editor of the 'Princeton Review,' that if we reason in a circle, it is not a *vicious* circle. For we do not prove the Church by the Scriptures in the same sense in which we prove the Scriptures by the Church. We take the Scriptures, when reasoning with those who profess to admit them, not as the word of God but as authentic historical documents, to prove the foundation and commission of the Church; and

then we take the Church, not to prove that the Scriptures are authentic historical documents (what is already demonstrated from other evidence extrinsic to the Church), but to show they are divinely inspired, the written word of God. Is there here anything resembling what logicians call a *vicious* circle?'' The same writer, turning, as the saying is, the tables against his adversaries, shows (vol. VIII, p. 426) that Protestantism is forced by its own principles always to move in a vicious circle, for it proves its rule of faith by its belief, and its belief by its rule of faith. Then he adds: ''We see no way by which it can get out of this circle. It is not only as a Catholic we have felt this difficulty; we felt it as a Protestant, when we had the misfortune to be a Presbyterian, like our learned friend, the Princeton Professor.''

187. Though the preceding remarks may suffice to dispose of the charge here referred to, yet we cannot deprive our readers of the thorough and very able refutation given by Bishop England (vol. I, pp. 105–106). It is as follows:

''Dr. Watts, in his Treatise of Logic, and other Protestant writers of his description, charge Roman Catholics with gross and palpable absurdity in their arguments, and exemplify the sophism of the *Vicious Circle,* by reference to the argument of Catholics, viz.:

'' 'A vicious circle is, when two propositions, equally uncertain, are used to prove each other. Thus, Catholics prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of their Church, and then prove the infallibility of their Church from the authority of the Scriptures.'

''To a school-boy this appears a formidable barrier against Popery, and many a sage professor has learnedly declaimed against Popish absurdity in the detail of the exemplification. Stamped with the authority of a *dictum* of the schools, the example passes with equal currency as the definition.

''Let us meet the mighty adversary. To do so as thoroughly as we may, we must take the following three several cases.

''Case 1. A Catholic argues with a person who believes in the authority of the Scriptures, but who does not believe in the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. No one will

tell us that the said Catholic is guilty of bad logic and is a sophist, when he thus addresses such a person—'Sir, you admit this book to be authoritative; I shall show you from several passages thereof, that the Church is infallible.' This is not a vicious circle, for there is no question between them of the authority of the Scriptures, and to such a person the Catholic does not prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of the Church. Hence, in this case, there is no vicious circle, for if he proves the infallibility of the Church from the authority of the Scriptures, he only proves that which has been questioned from that of which there was no question.

"Case 2. A Catholic argues with a person who acknowledges the infallibility of the Church, but questions and doubts the authority of certain books of Holy Writ. No one can say it would be sophistry to address such a person in these words—'Sir, you allow the body of true believers, that is the Church, does certainly know what God has revealed, and can point out with infallible certainty the books which do contain His revelations. Sir, that Church testifies to you that these books do contain His revelation. Therefore, by your principle, you must receive these books as the word of God.'

"This certainly is not proving one questionable proposition by another, and then proving the second by the first. But it is proving that which has been questioned and of which there was doubt by that of which there was no doubt. This is no sophistry.

"Case 3. A Catholic argues with a person who does not believe either in the infallibility of the Church or in the authority of the Scriptures. In this case he cannot assume either as a principle. What is he to do? What would a Protestant do? The Catholic can do at least as much. The Protestant says that without the authority of an infallible Church he can prove the authority of the Scriptures. The same arguments will, in the mouth of a Catholic, lead to the same conclusion. Therefore, *if it be possible* for the Protestant, it is possible for the Catholic—therefore the Catholic needs not the infallibility of the Church to do what his neighbor can do without it.

"Having proved the authority of the Scriptures thus, the Catholic may next proceed upon what he has proved, now assuming as a principle that of which there can be no doubt. Thus we are brought to case 1, in which there is no sophism.

"Or the Catholic may find, without the authority of the Scripture, reasons to convince a person, that if God speaks He must establish some mode by which man may infallibly find out what He teaches; and next that this mode is by receiving the testimony of the great body of the Church; and thus we are brought to case 2, in which there is no sophism."

188. Remark by the Editor. It is advisedly said—"*if it be possible,*" for we hold and shall soon prove that whoever discards the infallible authority of the Church becomes utterly unable to demonstrate the divine origin and inspiration of the Scriptures. In other words, the only irresistible argument, that can be alleged against all opponents to prove that the Bible is the Word of God, is that derived from the living, unerring voice of the Catholic Church, the heaven-appointed guardian, witness, preserver and interpreter of Holy Writ. Moreover, we must here bear in mind the fact that a Catholic theologian, even in the third case referred to above, can make his demonstration without incurring the sophism of the vicious circle; for he demonstrates the existence, character and office of the Church by arguing from the Scriptures, not as a divinely inspired book, but simply as an authentic, reliable record of God's dealings with man: a record whose authenticity rests on a far firmer foundation than that of any other book; for, to speak only of the New Testament, that Sacred Record carries with it the unbroken witness, authority and tradition of nineteen hundred years of Christian belief.

"Thus, whether a Catholic argues with a person who allows the authority of Scripture, but does not allow Church infallibility; or argues with a person who allows Church infallibility, but does not allow Scriptural authority; or argues with a person who does not allow either; he proceeds to prove both points without sophistry: he does not argue in a vicious circle—he is not a violator of the rules of sound sense or good logic—and Dr. Watts and his imitators were either very ignorant of the

manner in which Catholics argue, or very ignorant of what is meant by the sophism of a vicious circle—or were dishonest men who deceived their pupils upon an important subject, and who bore false testimony against the best and most numerous and most enlightened society in the whole world.

"We leave to their admirers and followers their choice of the several portions of this good disjunctive proposition, and we trust that each day will add new light to the intellect, and new desires to the will, so that true knowledge may increase, sophistry be detected and exposed, and the most important concerns of men be brought more closely under the eye of reason and the regulation of correct judgment."

> "A little learning is a dangerous thing;
> Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring:
> There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
> But drinking largely sobers us again."—*Pope.*

189. In the preceding quotation from Bishop England we furnished to our readers a complete refutation of the well-known sophism of the Vicious Circle, which non-Catholics at times bring as an argument against the Catholic Church, and we moreover stated the fact that whoever discards and rejects her infallible authority becomes utterly unable to demonstrate, in a convincing manner, the divine origin and inspiration of the Scriptures. In other words, whosoever does not admit the infallibility of the Catholic Church cannot prove that the Bible, or any part of it, is the word of God. To complete the discussion of this most important subject, we will present to our readers the following very cogent and judicious remarks of Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S.S., taken from his erudite work entitled "General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture." The learned Sulpician professor proves what we have asserted, viz., that the only irresistible argument to demonstrate against all opponents the divine inspiration of the Bible is that derived from the living, unerring, authoritative voice of the Catholic Church, the heavenly appointed guardian, witness, preserver and interpreter of Holy Writ.

"Before proceeding to state the proofs upon which Catholics

rest their belief in the inspired character of the Bible, it may not be amiss to explain and examine the position of Protestants in that regard. The importance of the question for the latter cannot be exaggerated. Catholics build their faith primarily on the teaching of a living Church, whereas Protestants rest their whole belief on the written Word of God. They have, therefore, to establish by irresistible arguments the divine character of the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments. A difficult task, at which the ablest minds among them have assiduously labored, but with results far from satisfactory, as we shall see presently, and as, in fact, some of the most enlightened Protestants candidly confess. One of them, Robert F. Horton, "The Inspiration and the Bible," in an inductive essay on Biblical Inspiration, writes pertinently: "The point which strikes us is that Christians are more certain that the Bible is inspired than they are of the grounds of their certainty. . . . The belief may be well grounded, and yet no one who holds it may be adequately able to state the grounds; and all the statements put together and harmonized may still leave one in some astonishment how a conviction so sure and so momentous should rest upon so slender and wavering a foundation."

190. We must bear in mind that, to demonstrate the divine character of Holy Scripture, there are grounds common to Catholics and to Protestants. Several of the arguments advanced by Protestants in favor of the divine character of the Bible have been used with great effect by Catholic apologists in our century and before. The elevating character of the Sacred Scriptures, their super-human contents, and their organic unity, are grounds common to all believers in Holy Writ, and when set forth in striking manner, are very helpful to souls struggling against infidelity. Catholic theologians, however, while mentioning these as a confirmation of the Christian belief in inspiration, prefer to appeal to *authority* as proof in favor of this doctrine.

The first ground which is common to Catholic and to Protestant scholars, is the authority of Christ and His Apostles. On both sides they point out how every man who

recognizes the divine character of Christ and believes in His heavenly mission, must regard as inspired all the books of the Old Testament, because He either quoted them explicitly as the Word of God, or referred to them in general terms, such as "the Scripture," "the Holy Scripture," etc., the obvious meaning of which at the time was that they had been written under a special divine influence. On both sides, too, they appeal to the testimony of the Apostles, who spoke of the Old Testament Scriptures in exactly the same terms as their Divine Master, and unquestionably shared the belief of their Jewish contemporaries in the inspiration of all their contents.

The second ground common to Catholics, and to a certain number of Protestant scholars, is the testimony of the early Church. Apart from the infallible character of her teaching, the early Church bears witness to the fact that when the sacred writers had not yet all left this world, or had but recently disappeared, her great teachers, such as St. Clement, St. Polycarp, St. Justin, St. Irenæus, etc., had learned to regard as *divine,* and to quote as the *words of the Holy Ghost,* the writings of the Old and New Testaments. Thus, then, the human testimony of the early Church may be appealed to by Catholics and Protestants, in order to complete whatever might be missing in the preceding argument to prove that *all* the books of the Bible should be regarded as inspired.

It should, however, be borne in mind, as already pointed out, that once this testimony of the early Church is regarded as valid, the inspiration of the deutero- as well as of the proto-canonical books of the Old Testament should be admitted, since it is a historical fact that the early Church held these two classes of books as equally sacred and inspired.

191. It must, however, be admitted that there are grounds special to Catholics in favor of inspiration,to which no Protestant of any denomination can appeal consistently with his fundamental principle, viz., the rejection of the infallible authority of the Roman Catholic Church and of the testimony of Tradition.

Over and above the grounds which are common to Protestants and Catholics, there is the distinctly Catholic argument,

which rests the belief in the inspiration of the Bible directly on the divine authority of a living Church. It is plain that whatever difficulties may be raised against the doctrine of biblical inspiration in the name of history, of higher criticism, geology, etc., Catholics will ever find a solid ground for their Faith on this point in the simple consideration that the inspired character of the Bible is certain beyond all doubt, since the Church, speaking with divine and consequently infallible authority, teaches it as a truth revealed by God. This is the ground which Catholic theologians and ecclesiastical writers naturally appeal to after they have established the right of a living Church to teach Revelation with divine authority; and it is the proof upon which St. Augustine—and no doubt countless minds after him—felt it necessary to fall back upon when he said: "I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Church moved me thereto."

As it has been demonstrated above (n. 166), fair-minded historians cannot contest to the Catholic Church her well-merited reputation of meekness and mercy in dealing with rebellious subjects. But here her enemies cry out: "How do you reconcile your assertion with the rigors of the Inquisition?" This is the charge made against her in books, reviews, journals and pamphlets of writers opposed to our Faith. It is, then, important to treat this question, which has given rise to so many odious declamations and bitter invectives.

CHAPTER IV

THE INQUISITION

192. The enemies of the Catholic Church are in the habit of casting up against her the word Inquisition as if it were a condemnation without appeal.

It is well to remark at the outset that, except in the case of a few people of slight education at the best, who permit themselves to be taken unawares and led away, the hatred of the Inquisition is confounded with hatred of the Church.

We know from their literary works, novels, plays, journals,

etc., the tactics of the enemies of that institution. Their aim is to strike at the *imagination,* and excite the *feelings* by a moving picture or by a skilful and dramatic arrangement of incidents. These writers are careful not to inform their readers that the use of torture and other severe penalties, resorted to at the time of the Inquisition, entirely opposed as those means are to modern customs, was in full conformity with the penal code of past centuries, and *habitually used* by all the tribunals of those times in all countries. In the eyes of these writers, the moment blood is shed or fire lit, the cause is judged and the tribunal is held to be in the wrong. They do not reason, they declaim; they do not try to convince their readers, but only seek to arouse their indignation. It is plain that honest men do not act in this way.

It is not thus that history should be written. It should have no other aim than that of telling the truth. "Its first law," says Leo XIII in the Brief on Historical Studies (August 18, 1893), "is to assert nothing false and to have no fear of telling the truth." The Church also only requires the truth, and we, her defenders, do not intend to use any other weapon than that in her service. Let us, therefore, reason this matter out, and tell the *whole truth* concerning the Inquisition, as much at least as it is possible to do within the narrow limits to which we are obliged to confine ourselves.

I.—Origin and Nature of the Ecclesiastical Inquisition

193. Above all, it is necessary to distinguish carefully the *Ecclesiastical* Inquisition from the *Spanish* Inquisition.

1. *Inquisition* in general means the searching for heretics, with the view of repressing their proselytism or of converting them. In this sense the Inquisition dates from the very beginning of the Church; it was always the *strict duty of the Popes and Bishops* to fight heresy, to prevent its spread, either by means of gentleness and persuasion, or, when these failed, by punishment.

2. However, by *Inquisition* is generally understood, *a court of justice,* called the Holy Office, *ecclesiastical and also*

civil, established to inquire into the crime of heresy and to punish the guilty. This special tribunal only dates from the beginning of the XIIIth century, when Pope Innocent III founded it to repress the heresy of the Albigenses and the Waldenses. Reviving the heresy of the Manicheans, these sectaries spread, with their errors, the spirit of revolt, and, with weapons in their hands, they threatened to destroy both the Church and the State. Every effort was made to bring them back to their duty by instruction and persuasion, but in vain. Then the two powers thus menaced *united their forces against the common enemy;* to the ecclesiastical power fell the duty of ascertaining the crime, to the other that of inflicting the penalty.

This *Ecclesiastical Inquisition* always had for its purpose to preserve the Catholic people from the poison of heresy, and the State from the revolts which were its usual consequence. The duty of the Inquisitor was generally confided to legates or delegates, among whom were distinguished in the first rank the sons of St. Dominic, but only from the year 1223, that is to say, *twelve years after the death of their founder,* which does not prevent the enemies of the Church from transforming this Saint into a *Grand Inquisitor.*

Instituted by the mother of all Churches, successively introduced into nearly all parts of the Christian world, the Ecclesiastical Inquisition was undoubtedly the work of the Roman Pontiffs, who never regretted having established it.

194. 3. Quite different was the *Spanish Inquisition,* founded by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1481, to preserve, with the Christian Faith, the Spanish nation from the conspiracies of the Jews and Moors, who feigned to be Christians in order to carry out their wicked designs against the Church, as well as against the State. In this tribunal there existed two distinct jurisdictions, one of which depended upon the Church, the other upon the State. But in Spain the civil power had so great a preponderance that many historians, though far from favorable to Catholicism, consider the Spanish Inquisition as *more of a political than of a religious* institution.

We admit that Sixtus IV did approve the *first project* of

the Spanish Inquisition, and that he sanctioned its fundamental statute. It was from the Holy See that the *Ecclesiastical* Inquisitors received their jurisdiction and all their *spiritual* powers. The king, however, had obtained from the Pope the power to nominate them for the office.

195. Object of the Discussion. All discussion concerning the Inquisition may be reduced to the two following questions, which are altogether distinct from each other.

First Question. Was the institution of this tribunal legitimate *in principle;* in other words, was it in accordance with right and justice?

Second Question. Were the proceedings of the Inquisition, as we know them through reliable history, deserving of the condemnation with which they are stigmatized, and can they be made a subject of reproach against the Church?

We must not forget that in all this discussion there is no question of infidels, pagans and Jews, over whom the Church has no jurisdiction, and whom the Church never pretended to constrain, but that it refers solely to Christians, that is to say, to people whom regeneration by baptism *had subjected to her laws.* "The former," says St. Thomas, "must not be compelled to obedience to the Church; the others, on the contrary, should be coerced: *contra vero alteri sunt cogendi.*"

II.—Lawfulness of the Inquisition in Principle

196. **A.** On the Part of the Church. For a Catholic there can be no doubt on the subject. Popes and Councils, saints and doctors, the Scripture and tradition, proclaim that the Church, as a perfect society, has the right, and it is her duty, to watch over the purity of the Faith, and to inflict punishment, even corporal punishment, upon those of *her children* who forsake the truth and become a stumbling block to their brethren. This undeniable right, which flows from the very powers, which Jesus Christ confided to her, the Church has always exercised; she always regarded the crimes of heresy, apostasy and sacrilege deserving of punishment, as much as attacks against the property, the honor and the life of man.

This *doctrine* and this *conduct* of the Church are perfectly reasonable and legitimate.

It is the right and the duty of every perfect society to lead its members efficaciously to the purpose of its institution, and to watch over its own preservation. The Church being a perfect society, established by Christ, and provided by her Divine Founder with everything necessary for her preservation and propagation, possesses therefore this right, and can consequently enact laws and punish those of her subjects who will not obey them. If they prove themselves in every way refractory and rebellious, *devios et contumaces,* according to the expression of Benedict XIV, it is the right and the duty of the Church, as a mother, tender, it is true, but free from weakness, to correct them, in order that punishment may bring them back to due submission and prevent others from being led away by evil example. She does as the father of a family, when by wise and effective measures he corrects his children and endeavors to preserve his hearth from everything that might disturb its peace and happiness. She does as governments do every day, when by a system of vigorous precautions and sanitary enactments, they prevent the introduction of cholera or other epidemics; or again, when they appoint a body of special agents to look after malefactors, conspirators, assassins, to deliver them over to the vengeance of the law, and to render impossible the execution of their evil designs.

What the rod of the father is to the family, what to civil society are sanitary cordons, medical commissions, the police and the courts, the Inquisition was all this for religious society, that is to say, a means of preservation for itself and for its members.

197. **B.** On the Part of the State. When it comes to judging of the legitimacy of an institution, we must go back *to the times during which it was established.* There is no one who does not know that at the time of the Inquisition *European society was profoundly Christian;* people were as convinced of the truth of Catholic dogmas as in our day *in modern society they are convinced of the truths of the principles of natural law;* they thought with good reason that revolt

against God was no less culpable than revolt against the king.

Rulers and people, moreover, considered the preservation of the Catholic religion, in their eyes the only true and divine religion, as a *social* good of far greater importance than all worldly possessions. The legislation of all the countries of Europe was founded upon the close alliance of Church and State. Consequently, every disobedience to the laws of religion became amenable to the civil law as soon as the transgressions became manifest *by exterior acts.*

In such a condition of things nothing could be more natural than *the establishment of tribunals,* whose purpose it was to ascertain by honest and legal means *exterior* violations of the religious law, to distinguish *obstinate* heretics from those who only yielded to temporary error, to punish the really guilty and proclaim the innocence of the others. These tribunals were as legitimate as in our day are the courts called upon to judge crimes against the State or against the person, the reputation or the fortune of its subjects. We say *exterior* violations, for it is clear that the interior secret of conscience is accessible to God alone; consequently human law cannot make laws for *interior acts,* nor punish violations which are not outwardly produced. Hence the principle of Canon Law, "*Ecclesia non judicat de internis.*"

It is because they were imbued with these *truths* that Theodosius the Great, Justinian, Charlemagne, Otho the Great, Louis XI, all the rulers and all civilized nations did not think that to punish heresy and apostasy was to do violence to conscience.

198. Conclusion. *In a society constituted according to the principles, which we have just set forth and in presence of legislative measures enacted accordingly,* no one can reasonably deny that the Church acted with wisdom, by establishing *conjointly with the temporal power,* to which it left the task of inflicting the merited punishment, a tribunal to ascertain with greater certainty and guarantee of justice the real culprits, and to take cognizance of offenses rightly considered as most detrimental both to social order and religious faith.

199. Remark. If there are men who find it difficult to

admit this conclusion, it is because we live in an atmosphere which is saturated with errors. To favor the spread of evil, and for their own security, the enemies of religion constantly represent all *repression* of impiety and heresy as an outrage against what they falsely call the sacred rights of conscience.

It is nevertheless beyond all doubt that no man can claim for himself the right to do evil. It is certain that man has not and cannot have, as some pretend in our day, the *natural* and inviolable right to think, write and propagate everything that pleases him. Created by God, and depending upon Him in every respect, he has not the right to launch forth outrage and blasphemy against the Author of his existence. Becoming a child of the Church by baptism, he has not the right to rise in revolt against his Mother and to fight her. As a member of society he has not the right to strive to sap the foundations upon which society rests. Endowed with free will, enabling him to do what is *good and just meritoriously,* he has not the right to abuse it, and so corrupt the morals of his brethren and bring them to ruin. (n. 166.) It is equally undeniable that there are errors which are *culpable.* Indeed, there are failings of reason which practically cannot be distinguished from moral perversion. Man is *obliged* above all to adhere to the truth and to preserve his intelligence free from error; this is evident, for, in order *to will,* it is necessary to know, and, to *will justly,* it is necessary to know correctly. If there were no rule for *thought* there could not be any rule for action. What would then become of morality and society? A man who tolerates error, knowing it to be error, must be either full of malice or a most despicable character. No mathematician would listen to a false proposition in mathematics, without correcting it; and no good lawyer allows his friends to make a fallacious assumption in a legal matter without telling them of their error. Can we then suppose that a man of integrity, who knows a truth, and knows that he has it from God Himself through the appointed channels of communication, would act as if that truth were no better than fiction? Hence, as we have stated above (n. 166), every Catholic that is sincere, is intolerant, and if he is not intolerant, he is

either a hypocrite, or else he does not really believe what he professes. Among culpable errors stand foremost the sins of unbelief, heresy and apostasy. In reality, is there any outrage against the honor, the life or the property of a man, a mere creature, which can be compared, as to gravity, with these great crimes, which directly attack the Creator Himself? To refuse *obstinately* to believe in the revelation of God *sufficiently known as such,* is a crime of high treason against the Divinity, for it is to deny and impugn in a manner the veracity of God. Now, at the time and in the countries where the Inquisition existed, it was easy for all to have a complete moral certitude (proportionate, however, to the mental condition and development of each man) concerning the divinity of the Christian religion and the truth of the Catholic Church. It would be well to read chapter xxxiv, entitled: "Tolerance in Matters of Religion," in the excellent work of Balmes, entitled, "Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in Their Effects on the Civilization of Europe."

III.—What Should Be Thought of the Proceedings of the Inquisition in General and of the Spanish Inquisition in Particular?

200. We have just proven that the Inquisition was legitimate in principle; and that in the times and countries where it was established, there existed the right to punish those found guilty of propagating religious errors. But should we not severely condemn the manner in which this right was exercised? Was there not cruelty in executing the sentences pronounced against the criminals? This is the question now to be examined. We shall solve it by the aid of a few remarks.

201. First Remark. This question is far from having the same importance as the first. It would be indeed absurd to reproach *the Church* with the abuses of which the judges of the Inquisition may have been guilty. As we can reasonably impute to a man only the acts and effects which are the result of his personal activity, in the same way we can reproach a social body only with what is the result of its nature and social action, in other words, of its constitutive principles, of its laws, and the regular exercise of its authority. Who, indeed, would

consider himself justified in holding civil law or military rules responsible for abuses of authority committed by the violation of these laws and rules which the civil and military authority have enacted, and whose transgression they rightly condemn and punish? Now, the abuses which are brought forward against the Inquisition are far from being the result of the principles of Catholicism; they are, on the contrary, radically opposed to its spirit, and, in fact, they have been severely blamed by the Sovereign Pontiffs every time that they were brought to their notice. As history proves, it must be said to the everlasting credit of the Roman Pontiffs, that they never favored the Spanish Inquisition. Leo X wished to abolish it altogether. Paul III, Pius IV, and Gregory XIII strenuously opposed its introduction into the Kingdom of Naples, and the Duchy of Milan, then subject to the Spanish Crown.

From the beginning of the action of the Spanish Inquisition Pope Sixtus IV was very ill contented with it, and urged his objections so strongly that the ambassadors of both courts were ordered to leave their respective stations, and Ferdinand commanded all his subjects to leave Rome. The Pope at last made concessions by the Bull of November 1, 1478. On receiving further accounts of the cruelties done by the Inquisitors of Seville, he retracted the Bull, and ordered that in future the Inquisitors should pass no judgment without the assistance of the bishops. He further commanded that the Inquisition should not be established in any other province, there being already the ordinary tribunals of the bishops. When Isabella afterwards desired the withdrawal of the decree which ordered the bishops to sit with the Inquisitors, Pope Sixtus IV courteously, but firmly, refused. The next year, in order to temper the severity of the Inquisition, he appointed Manrique, Archbishop of Seville, as Papal Judge of Appeals, before whom all who thought themselves harshly treated by the Inquisitors could take their cases. He further allowed an appeal from the archbishop to himself. The Holy Father thus quashed many prosecutions and softened the punishments in other cases. He, moreover, required that all those who abjured their heresy should be treated with the utmost leniency; and

conjured the King and Queen, "by the bowels of mercy in Jesus Christ," to show more tenderness to their subjects—to those even who had unfortunately fallen into error. But King Ferdinand, and afterwards the Emperor Charles V, replied by endeavoring to stop appeals from being carried to Rome.

202. Second Remark. Even if the accusations of wanton cruelty and bloodshed charged against the Inquisition were well grounded, this would be no argument against the legitimacy of that tribunal. To prove an abuse of a thing does not prove the necessity of suppressing the lawful use of it; otherwise every human institution or invention would have to be put down, and not even railways, telegraphs and telephones would escape. An institution is deservedly condemned only when the abuses are not *accidental,* but spring *necessarily* from its *essential* character; that is, when the abuse is the effect caused by the institution itself. Apply these considerations to the Roman Inquisition, of which we speak now. The mode of proceeding against accused persons was accurately defined by Bulls of the Popes, and by Canon Law. No one could even be imprisoned until his guilt had been clearly established before a judicial tribunal. No one could be worried by excessive delays in conducting the trial. There were stringent rules with regard to the character of witnesses, and false testimony was treated with the utmost severity. The judges were ordered never to condemn anyone except on the clearest proofs of guilt, for, as the Pontiffs said, it is better that crime should go unpunished than that even one innocent man should be punished as guilty. Moreover, it must be noted that confession of guilt would at once have exempted the accused from all punishment, or at least have secured so great a mitigation of its rigor that it ceased to deserve the name. What other tribunal is there, it has been justly asked, where a *plea of guilty* would be followed by such merciful consequences? We have here a perfect imitation of what actually takes place in the tribunal of penance, where sincere confession of guilt is invariably followed by sacramental absolution. Behold here how closely the Church, in her legislation, imitates the mercy

of her divine Founder! Hence we have reason to conclude that the proceedings of the Inquisition were far more just than those of any judicial court in Europe.

203. Third Remark. We must, moreover, remember that the judges appointed to impose corporal penalties for the crime of heresy were *civil* judges; the office of the ecclesiastical authority being that of establishing the guilt of the accused, a task entirely beyond the competence of the secular rulers. Wherever the tribunal inflicted severe or excessive punishment, death especially, the government was the agent; it is the government, therefore, that must bear the blame, when blame is rightly deserved (n. 201). Moreover, as we have seen, the State, Christian and Catholic, in lending to the Church the aid of the secular arm, was only fulfilling a duty, that of safeguarding the sacred rights of conscience and truth, and of protecting from all danger the paramount interests of civil society.

Divine authority and Christian tradition amply justify secular princes in aiding the Church with their power. Thus the Jewish people were commanded to try, and, after sentence, to stone, any one, whoever he might be, who blasphemed the Lord, or counselled them to apostatize, viz., to depart from the worship of the true God. (See Leviticus, 24, 14.) St. Augustine (d. A.D. 430) defended, or rather urged the most strenuous measures against the Donatists (furious heretics of the fourth century), in order to repress them. This, he said, is the proper exercise of the power (secular) instituted by God also for the preservation and defense of the Church. His doctrine on this point is tersely expressed in the following sentence of his 93d letter, n. ix: "Serviant reges terræ Christo, etiam leges ferendo pro Christo" (Let kings serve Christ by making laws in favor of Christ).

Moreover, *clemency,* which plays so great a part in the judgments of the Inquisition, was *the work of the Church,* who did nothing as to the punishments except to suppress or mitigate them, or to recommend the guilty to the indulgence of the judges. (See the "Life of Ximenes," by Hefele, translated from the German by the Rev. Canon Dalton, ch. 16, 17, 18.)

Hence the reputation for mercy which the ecclesiastical tribunals of the Inquisition enjoyed. This reputation was so great, that the Knights Templars expressly begged to be judged by the tribunals of the Ecclesiastical Inquisition. They knew well, historians said, that if they secured such judges they could not be condemned to the penalty of death. But Philip the Fair, who had determined upon their destruction, and who understood the inevitable consequence of a recourse to that tribunal, shut himself up with his Council of State and summarily condemned them to death. And in our day it was at Rome that the Jews received the best treatment; indeed a proverbial phrase calls the city of the Popes the paradise of the Jews. In Germany, where formerly there were many ecclesiastical sovereignties, there was another proverb, which said: "It is good to live under the crozier." "Never," says Joseph de Maistre, "under these pacific governments was there a question of prosecution or of capital punishment against the spiritual enemies of the reigning power." (See Baluffi, "Charity of the Church toward the Jews," ch. xxii.)

204. Fourth Remark. It is to give proof of great ignorance of history, or of singular hardihood in calumny, to represent cruel tortures as the distinctive and exclusive characteristic of the Inquisition. This, however, is what is done every day by anti-religious books, newspapers and reviews.

In reality these tortures were in *universal use*. They were thought necessary to intimidate the guilty. It would even be an easy task to prove that, taking all in all, the tribunals of the Inquisition proved themselves in general *much more equitable and less rigorous* towards the accused than any of the civil tribunals of those times. Hefele, in the work already cited, where so many interesting facts concerning the Inquisition of Spain are to be found, has been able to give proof of this even as regards that country, the most exposed to blame, and he has been able to do this even whilst accepting the data of Llorente, the *partial and untrustworthy historian* of the Inquisition.

It is principally upon the testimony of Llorente that the enemies of the Inquisition ground their charges. To be con-

vinced of the little confidence due to the assertions of Llorente, it is enough to know that after writing his work he was careful to *destroy* the original documents relative to that much maligned institution. By so doing he hoped thereby that it would be impossible to verifiy his assertions and contradict his statements. A little history concerning this individual will not be out of place, as it throws considerable light on our subject. When on May 10, 1808, the victorious advance of Napoleon forced Ferdinand VII to abdicate the throne of Spain, Llorente repaired to Bayonne, where he turned traitor to his country by swearing allegiance to the usurper of the Spanish crown, Joseph Bonaparte, who made him Counsellor of State, and who ordered him to write a history of the Spanish Inquisition, with a promise of a liberal compensation for his labor. The venal historian knew full well what kind of a work would suit the palate of his master, and he wrote accordingly. Both his patron and the hired compiler had a two-fold object in view, viz.: First, to blacken the character of the royal dynasty, and thus inspire into the Spanish people hatred and execration of their legitimate sovereigns. Secondly, to fasten on the Papal Court the responsibility of the excessive rigors of a tribunal that, through State interference, had become more political than ecclesiastical in its procedures. Can we put implicit faith in the statements of such an historian, who wrote with the avowed purpose of maligning that institution, and who, as we noticed above, burned the documents by which he could have been convicted of falsehood? A degraded priest and a venal historian, a dismissed official of the Inquisition and writing for the deliberate purpose of painting it in the most odious colors, he is justly liable to suspicion whenever his assertions can not be supported by other independent testimony. Yet it is mainly his work which has been the storehouse of weapons in the hands of infidels and Protestants against the tribunal of the Inquisition. Prescott, certainly no friend either to the Inquisition or to the Catholic Church (in his history of Ferdinand and Isabella), bears testimony against Llorente's truthfulness in the following words: "One might reasonably distrust Llorente's tables from the facility

with which he receives the most improbable estimates in other matters.'' Yet, strange to say, Prescott himself frequently bases his unmeasured strictures on the Inquisition on the authority of Llorente, the very witness against whose veracity he was honest enough to testify. So much for his reputation of fairness and consistency! (See Balmes, ''European Civilization,'' note in Appendix, p. 457.)

If the reader desires to form an idea what the tribunals were in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, he should read the learned memoir of M. Poullet, Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Louvain: *Histoire du droit pénal dans le duché de Brabant* (History of penal law in the Duchy of Brabant). We quote these few passages. ''In all their procedures there prevailed uncertainty, want of regularity and arbitrary dealings. The accused was deprived of the precious guarantee of publicity as to the proceedings; the judge could, if he pleased, refuse to the accused the assistance of counsel, and the supposed criminal was not allowed to be present at the deposition of testimony.'' Concerning the penalties in use, the same writer says: ''The general system breathed nothing but intimidation and public vengeance. The penalty of death was often accompanied by revolting cruelties, the judges endeavoring to proportion the torments accompanying the death penalty according to the various degrees of criminality in the offenders. After the penalty of death, the law recognized only corporal punishment, often producing irreparable consequences to the victim, and always degrading. Nothing was done to reform the criminal and to inspire him with better sentiments before returning him to social life. Imprisonment was only resorted to as a punishment and in cases of minor offenses. It had no place in the penal system properly so-called, and was never ordered when the judge was about to punish a crime of real gravity.''

What has been said of criminal jurisprudence in Brabant applies to the rest of Europe. In those days coiners of false money were burnt alive; those who gave false weights and measures were scourged or were condemned to death; burglars were led to the scaffold; thieves convicted of a relapse were

also condemned to death. A monument of the extreme severity of the civil tribunals was the *Caroline,* the penal code of Charles V, which governed the German Empire *until the last century.*

205. Fifth Remark. When men emphasize the recourse to *torture* as a special grievance against the Inquisition, they feign to ignore the fact that this means of discovering the truth was in use in all the tribunals of Europe.

A curious circumstance concerning this subject is related in the memoir of M. Poullet. The Councils of Justice of Belgium were consulted by Charles of Lorraine, in 1765 and 1766, as to projects of reform to be introduced into the criminal law, and particularly as to the advisability of the eventual abolition of torture. *All the Councils demanded its continuance.* A few years afterwards these same Councils were again required to give their opinion as to the employment of torture for the purpose of eliciting confession from the accused, and all of them repeated their first judgment.

We must also particularly remark that the Inquisition *renounced* the use of torture *long before* the other tribunals of Europe. "It is certain," says Llorente himself, "that for a long time the Inquisition no longer had recourse to torture." Moreover, contrary to the usage of all civil tribunals, the Inquisition did not permit the repeated application of torture during the same trial, and it required that a physician should be present to announce when torture would imperil the life of the patient.

206. Sixth Remark. As to the Spanish Inquisition in particular, we have no reluctance to acknowledge that abuses did exist. How could it be otherwise, when there as elsewhere, it was men who were the judges? However, it is important to make here a few special observations.

a. This tribunal was an institution more closely connected with the *State* than with the Church, and its members acted not according to the instructions of the Popes, but according to the orders of the King. As to the abuses, which can be rightfully brought against it, the Church was the first to condemn them. The Popes often protested against excessive se-

verity, and they went so far as to grant to all persons condemned by the royal tribunal the right to appeal to a special ecclesiastical judge. Later, seeing that the royal judges did not respect this right of appeal, the Sovereign Pontiff granted to all the condemned the right to appeal to the Apostolic See. Some Spanish Inquisitors themselves were even excommunicated, in spite of the anger of the King.

The Inquisition had not been in operation more than a single year before Pope Sixtus IV (A.D. 1472) entered his most emphatic protest against its cruelty. He wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella that "mercy towards the guilty was more pleasing to God than the severity which they were using." Both he, and his immediate successors in the papal throne, employed their best efforts to check and remedy the abuses of the royal tribunal, and they insisted that the civil status and the property of every accused person should be restored to him when acquitted, or, if condemned, that these should revert to his children and relatives.

In a word, the Church exhausted all the influence it possessed to induce the temporal rulers, the kings and the judges, to imitate the mildness and moderation of which she was herself the example. From all this, is it not absurd and unjust to hold the Papacy and the Church responsible for the excesses committed by the Spanish Inquisitors?

207. **b.** It is proved that the cruelties attributed to the Spanish Inquisition have been *exaggerated beyond measure,* and this with notorious dishonesty and bad faith. Llorente himself, this historian so hostile to the Church (n. 204), acknowledges that the prisons of the Inquisition were dry and high vaulted rooms, that they were palaces compared to the other prisons of Europe. No prisoner of the Inquisition, he assures us, was ever loaded with chains or iron collars. On the other hand, Mr. Bourgoing, ambassador to Spain, does not hesitate to say in his *"Tableaux de l'Espagne moderne"* (Tableaux of Modern Spain): "To render homage to the truth, I must acknowledge that the Inquisition might be cited in our day as a model of equity."

c. What, above all, makes the less educated people of our

day shudder, is the thought of the *auto-da-fé*. Its scenes are usually represented as frightful; around an immense fire, lit up to destroy a multitude of victims, are represented a fanatical crowd and especially the implacable judges of the Holy Office, hastening to contemplate with ferocious delight this spectacle worthy of cannibals.

The truth is that the *auto-da-fé,* that is to say, *the act of faith,* consisted, not in burning or putting to death, but in proclaiming the *acquittal* of the persons recognized as falsely accused and in reconciling repentant criminals to the Church. For this tribunal, like the tribunal of penance, *absolved those who repented.* After this absolution the *auto-da-fé* ended, and the *ecclesiastical* judges retired. *Obstinate* heretics alone, and those, whose offenses were partly civil, were handed over to the secular arm, to be dealt with according to the gravity of their crime.

208. **d.** It was question here then of a public profession of faith pronounced by the acquitted prisoner on his being set at liberty. This is the testimony of Llorente, a great enemy, as we have seen, of the Inquisition. That writer speaks of the gross ignorance of some that confounded the *auto-da-fé* (the act of faith) of the acquitted with the punishment of the convicted. Moreover, we must here remark that heresy was a crime which came under the jurisdiction of the Inquisitors; but it was not the only crime of which they took cognizance. In Spain they were the guardians not only of Catholic Faith, but also of public morals. More than a dozen other offenses were amenable to that tribunal, such as blasphemy, sacrilege, usury, polygamy, treason, and above all, sorcery and magic. The punishment was awarded by the secular judges, not by the Inquisition. Were the punishments severe? It was the laity who apportioned them. The laity, imbued as it was at that time with a genuine Catholic spirit, felt the gravity of an offense against God, and had some care for the honor of God. They did not make light of blasphemy, sacrilege, apostasy, or atheism, as it is done by secular rulers in our day under the absurd plea of liberty of conscience. They held that an insult to the Supreme Ruler of all nations was an insult to society

itself, and they measured the punishment by what they rightly esteemed the gravity of the offense. Hence, as Balmes wisely remarks in his often quoted work (p. 452, n. 26), "the Catholic Religion cannot be held responsible for any of the excesses of the Spanish tribunals; and when men speak of the Inquisition, they ought not to fix their eyes principally on that of Spain, but on that of Rome acting under the vigilant eye of the Sovereign Pontiffs." In fact, of the Inquisition, as it was in Rome, there are not wanting high authorities to affirm that it has never been known to pronounce a sentence of capital punishment; or, at least, it is unquestionable that such executions were extraordinarily rare. In Spain the Inquisition was severe, because, as we have shown, it was more of a civil and political institution, and because it often acted in opposition to Rome, the part of the world where humanity has suffered the least for the sake of religion.

209. **e.** Often the number of the victims of the Spanish Inquisition is stated as being hundreds of thousands, immolated during a short space of time. Now, the figures of Llorente himself give 35,000 as the approximate number of victims for the 331 years during which the Inquisition lasted. And again, in this number are included various categories of *malefactors* properly so called, who were subject to this tribunal, for instance smugglers, magicians or sorcerers, perjurers, usurers, seducers, and other criminals guilty of abominable excesses. Hence it clearly results that the number of those who were executed for wilful and obstinate adherence to heretical doctrines was comparatively insignificant, as the greatest portion of victims was made up of criminals, who, down to the commencement of the present century, would have been sentenced to death on conviction in any other tribunal of Europe.

Moreover, even this number is manifestly exaggerated. Thus, if we believe Llorente, at the *auto-da-fé* of Toledo of February 12th, May 1st and December 10th, there were 700, 900 and 750 accused persons respectively. The actual truth is that *there was not one single victim;* they were simply repenting criminals brought before the tribunal, and none were

put to death. Here, when it is a question of comparing the much decried severity of the Spanish Inquisition with the doings of rulers of other countries, we are of opinion that, on this point at least, Protestant objectors would do well to be silent. Certainly it is not wise for them to provoke a comparison, which, if impartially examined by the light of reliable historical facts, rather than that of traditional prejudice, will be found to redound to the credit of the Inquisition, and the disgrace of the secular tribunals of their countries. English Protestants in particular should remember the records concerning the use of the rack; of thrusting needles under the nails; of the *Scavenger's Daughter,* a hoop or circle of iron, in which a man's whole body was, as it were, folded up, and his hands, feet and head bound fast together; of the *Little Ease,* a chamber in which a man could neither sit nor stand, nor lie down; and of various other devices of torture which were used by the Protestant Legislature of England against Catholic priests. Though it is true that in Protestant countries, such as Germany, Switzerland and England, not to speak of other minor places, there was not and there could not be either the Spanish or the Roman Catholic Inquisition, yet it is not true that there existed in these regions no Inquisition at all. There were indeed in full blast the Protestant Inquisitions of Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, of Luther and Melanchthon, Calvin and Zwinglius, purposely organized against unoffending Catholics and directed to rob of their very life all who were courageous enough not to allow themselves to be robbed of their Faith. To give some statistics, all taken from Protestant authorities, Holinshed puts down the number of those who were butchered during the reign of the grand royal Inquisitor Henry VIII, by the hand of the public executioner, at 72,000; and of his worthy daughter, the *female* Inquisitor Elizabeth, Cobbett does not hesitate to inform his readers that "this sanguinary queen put to death more persons in one year than the Inquisition did during the whole of its duration, 331 years." It would be easy to prove that brutal violence and wholesale slaughter of innocent Catholics signalized the rise and growth of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland

and Southern France, not to speak of Holland, Denmark and Norway, where similar bloody scenes were enacted by the *reformers*. Though we have no intention to retaliate, yet in view of the historical documents we have adduced (nn. 167–175), we feel justified in advising our Protestant brethren that, as our Blessed Lord says in His Gospel, "they should first cast *the beam out of their own eye before clamoring about the mote in the eye of their neighbor.*" (Matt. 7, 5.) As the proverb has it, they that live in glass houses should be careful not to throw stones at their neighbor. Then, as we have seen, the intolerance of Protestants has been everywhere much more violent against Catholics, than that of Catholics against heretics. In fact, it was by a most sanguinary persecution that Protestant rulers forcibly snatched the people from their allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. And yet it is upon the members of this Church alone that some writers cast the blame of bloody persecution against their fellow men!

210. Seventh Remark. It is right to judge a tree by its fruits, and side by side with the odium cast upon the Inquisition, to learn the happy results which it produced. Now it can not be denied that, to a *great extent at least*, it is due to the Inquisition that many countries of Europe have preserved the Faith untainted for centuries, and in particular that they have been saved from the pernicious invasion of intolerant and sanguinary Protestantism. Voltaire, that bitter enemy of the Inquisition and of the Catholic Church, was candid enough to write: "During the 16th and 17th centuries, at the time of the Inquisition, the nation of Spain did not witness in her midst the bloody revolutions, the conspiracies against the throne, and the terrible disasters that desolated the other royal houses of Europe. No king was assassinated as in France, and no royal head was felled by the hand of the Executioner as in England." The Spanish Inquisition, notwithstanding all its rigors and excesses, which we freely admit, and the cause of which we have already adduced, can say this much in its defense. The Spanish Government saw all Europe in flames and all hands reeking with blood, wherever heresy and schism arose and the unity of Faith had been lost. The Peasants'

War, the Thirty Years' War, the excesses of the Anabaptists; seditions in France; the cruelties that desolated the Netherlands; the wholesale butcheries in England, particularly under Henry VIII and Elizabeth; the high-handed measures, exiles, confiscations and murders with which the Catholic Faith was exterminated, root and branch, from the people of Sweden, Norway and Denmark, taught the other European Catholic nations lessons not to be easily forgotten. The Spanish rulers seeing this, determined to spare Spain these and similar terrors, by preserving, at all costs, the unity of the Faith among that intensely Catholic people, and by stamping out and excluding from the realm even the first germs of the Protestant rebellion, which proselytizing zealots were trying to disseminate in the Spanish Peninsula. The Inquisition was the means devised for the purpose. How can we blame that tribunal for the death and tortures of a few obstinate heretics, when we see that thereby the whole of Spain was saved from interminable civil wars, and all the horrors that characterized the religious fanaticism of the sectarians of Northern Europe?

211. "Consider," writes Joseph de Maistre, "the Thirty Years' War, lit up by the inflammatory harangues of Luther; the unheard of atrocities of the Anabaptists and Peasants, the civil wars of France, England, Flanders, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the massacre of Merindol and the Cévennes; the murder of Mary Stuart, Henry III, Henry IV, Charles I, of the Prince of Orange. A ship could float in the blood which the Reformers caused to be shed. Do not tell us that the Inquisition produced this or that abuse; for this is not the question; what is really important is to know if, during the three last centuries, there has been, because of the Inquisition, more peace and happiness in Spain than in the other countries of Europe."

212. "The Inquisition," as Father Christie wisely remarks, "was the corrective to what we should call Lynch Law. Reflect for a moment what might have resulted from the uncontrollable indignation of the people, Catholic to the backbone, if men were found to blurt out blasphemies against all that such a people held to be holy, and to spread doctrines

which would seduce their children, the rising generation, from all that they deemed precious for this life and the next. What could we expect but tumultuary risings: terrible effects of violence and massacres—Lynch Law with all its horrors? The Tribunal of Faith prevented such consequences. At the outset of the sixteenth century, the Spaniards saw, as it were, the rising smoke, premonitory of a conflagration in Europe. They adopted the Inquisition as the means for preserving religious unity and preventing religious wars. Hence, during the three centuries after the re-organization of the Inquisition, Spain enjoyed more peace and prosperity than any other country in Europe. We have read with horror of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's: what was this massacre? The most satisfactory account would seem to be that without lawful process, under the direction of popular indignation, Lynch Law was executed on the assailants of the faith of Frenchmen. The proceeding was unjustifiable, but it took place because France had no Tribunal of Faith. (Ch. vi, n. 225.) Spain itself, before the Tribunal of Faith was set on its efficient footing by Sixtus the Fourth, had its St. Bartholomew in the massacre of the Jews in 1391, in which five thousand Jews perished. If then the very zeal of a people for that which it counts more precious than life itself, is liable to carry the multitude into excesses greatly to be deplored, it is evidently most desirable that a tribunal should exist which should judge cases without prejudice, which should protect the innocent, carry conviction to the mistaken, and punish those only who really deserved punishment.

"A reproach has been made against the Inquiistion," says Joseph de Maistre, "that it exercised a blighting influence upon the human mind. Now, the brilliant century of Spanish literature was that of Philip II . . . It is in vain that men will keep repeating that it is putting fetters on genius to forbid it from attacking dogmas, held by the whole nation; error can never be justified simply because of its repetition." "*Lettre à un gentilhomme sur l'Inquisition Espagnole*" (Letter to a gentleman concerning the Spanish Inquisition).

213. Eighth Remark. Let us make a last remark that will

allay the ridiculous terror which certain men are pleased to excite. If, as we have seen, the Church has an undeniable right to punish heretics (n. 196), and if she did make use of this right when it was proper to do so, she is in nowise obliged to use it always; she must even discontinue to use it when its exercise would become impossible or hurtful. One thing is the right and quite another thing its exercise. The former rests on justice; the latter depends on prudence, and may vary according to circumstances. And as a matter of fact, the Church has renounced the exercise of this right long ago, so that the Inquisition is now nothing more than an historical *remembrance* and a bugbear in the service of ignorance, bigotry or impiety. They who pretend to tremble at the recollection of this dread tribunal can now sleep in peace; the Catholic sword is no longer suspended over their heads. Would to heaven that in all countries Catholics were equally secure against the attacks of the secular power usually little given to tolerance. To enable our readers to pursue more at length the study of this question, in which we have been comparatively brief, we shall append a list of works that will not fail to substantiate all our assertions, and prove agreeable to those who are honest enough to act on the principle "*audi alteram partem*"—hear both sides of the question before you pronounce a definite judgment. (See end of this Part.)

CHAPTER V

THE PROCESS OF GALILEO

214. The condemnation of Galileo is also a weapon frequently employed by the enemies of the Church. It is because, in their eyes, this condemnation disproves at the same time the *infallibility* of the Pope, and demonstrates the opposition of the Church to the progress of science. Let us see if these accusations are well founded.

Historical Notice. Galileo (A.D. 1564–1642), a learned astronomer and distinguished philosopher, born at Pisa, but by his residence belonging to Florence, adopted, at the beginning

of the XVIIth century, the opinion of Copernicus (A.D. 1473–1543), a Canon of the Church, who taught the immobility of the sun and the rotation of the earth. Whilst Copernicus could teach this theory without being molested, Galileo was, on the 24th of February, 1616, attainted by the censure of the Holy Office. No book of Galileo was condemned, but the doctrine of Copernicus which he was defending, as to the diurnal motion of the earth on its axis and the immobility of the sun, was declared false in philosophy, contrary to Holy Writ and formally heretical. However, this censure was a *secret* act, and compromised only the Consulters of the Roman Congregation, for whose decision no infallibility was ever claimed. Accordingly no discussion arose concerning this view of the censure. The following Thursday, on the report of the Cardinals of the Holy Office, the Pope ordered that this censure should be notified to Galileo and that he be forbidden to teach the doctrine of the motion of the earth. The order, however, does not contain *a single word* of Paul V, by which this doctrine is characterized; moreover, we must remark, this is a secret document, having nothing in common with an *ex-cathedra definition* (n. 121). Then came a decree of the Index, dated the 5th of March, 1616, which prohibited books *written* in favor of the Copernican system. As to Galileo, he was never subjected to any corporal penance. He continued to reside in his villa near Florence, enjoying the friendship and favors of Urban VIII. Finally, in 1633, judgment was rendered condemning Galileo to retract the teaching which was then judged to be erroneous. It establishes simply the guilt of Galileo, and fixes the spiritual penalties, which he was to undergo. The decree of 1616 is only recalled as *a historical fact*. "The Sacred Congregation of the Index," it states, "has rendered a decree wherein books maintaining this doctrine are prohibited and the doctrine itself is declared *false* and contrary to the Sacred Scriptures." There is here no trace of a public and official intervention of the Sovereign Pontiff in his capacity of Supreme Pastor, either in the pronouncing of heresy against the Copernican system, or in the examination and condemnation of Galileo.

It results from the account that the only important decree from the *doctrinal* point of view is that of the 5th of March, 1616, because it attributes to the biblical text a meaning which as we now know, this text does not bear. Let us now see what we must think of this decree, and solve two questions closely connected with it.

I.—The Error Contained in the Decree of 1616 Proves Nothing against the Infallibility of the Church or against the Infallibility of the Pope

215. The proof of this is as plain as it is peremptory. The decree of 1616 is not one of those judgments to which the Church attributes the privilege of infallibility. For:

1. We have previously seen (n. 121) the conditions necessary in order that the doctrinal teachings of the Sovereign Pontiff should enjoy the privilege of infallibility. It is necessary that the Pope should speak *ex-cathedra,* that is in the discharge of his office as Supreme Pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority; and that he should decree that a doctrine concerning Faith or morals defined by him must be believed by the whole Church. Now the decree of 1616 alleged by our opponents is wanting in the characteristics required by the Vatican Council. In a word, no doctrine is imposed upon the belief of the whole Church; it is only a *disciplinary measure,* to prevent the diffusion of certain books. It is quite true that *the preamble* which precedes the decree, and makes known the motive that dictated it, contains a doctrinal error; for the theory of the diurnal motion of the earth on its axis is neither false nor contrary to Scripture; but the decision itself is simply a disciplinary judgment emanating from a fallible body. It was the erroneous decision of a fallible tribunal (n. 114). But, it may be asked, did not the Roman Pontiff confirm the decree by some official public act or definition, binding on all the Faithful and thereby make it his own? The Encyclopædia Britannica, which represents the conclusions of educated English opinion, shall answer this question: "This edict, it is essential to observe, of which the responsibility rests with a disciplinary

congregation, in no sense representing the Church, was never confirmed by the Pope, and was virtually repealed in 1757 by Benedict XIV." (Ninth Edition, Vol. X, p. 32.)

2. To this decisive proof let us add that the *form itself* of the decree fully confirms what we say. In all doctrinal definitions emanating from the Holy See, and acknowledged as infallible, it is always the *Pope* who teaches *directly* and not by the intermediary voice of the Cardinals. No instance can be cited of a doctrinal decision generally recognized as infallible that was rendered in the form of the decree concerning Galileo.

3. There is another argument of great force: contemporary documents prove that the Pope himself and the dignitaries of his court *never considered* this decree as an infallible definition. The same thing may be said of the theologians of that period and of those who followed; none can be cited who considered this decree as a final and infallible decision. We could, on the contrary, name a great number who positively hold the contrary. Their names and opinions may be found in the works and articles of M. Gilbert or in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique* (Apologetic Dictionary) of the Abbé Jaugey, article *Galileo,* vol. 1, p. 1315. Finally the idea of seeing in this decree an *ex-cathedra* definition did not occur even to the most bitter *enemies* of Galileo, who would have found in such a definition the best weapon to strike a decisive blow against his theories.

4. A dogmatic definition can never be reversed, yet from the very beginning contemporaries looked on this decree as reformable. In fact, in 1757, the decree of 1616 against teaching Copernicanism was revoked, and the books referring to it were expunged from the catalogue of forbidden books. The Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine, a contemporary and special friend and adviser of Galileo, writes, in his letter to Foscarini, that "should satisfactory proofs be adduced (and such proofs as yet had not been adduced) of the earth's rotary motion, he is quite prepared to change his views as to the meaning of the Scripture texts referring to this point." The Jesuit astronomer Grossi, in 1623, remarked: "When a scientific demonstration

of the earth's movement shall be brought forward, it will then be fitting to interpret Scripture otherwise than has hitherto been done." Galileo's case, then, evidently had no bearing on Papal infallibility, a conclusion which we are glad to be able to support by a quotation from a Protestant writer, the late Mr. Proctor, the eminent astronomer, the learned mathematician, and the distinguished editor of several scientific publications: "Quite incorrect," he says, "is the idea that Papal infallibility is disproved by the decision against Galileo. The Catholic doctrine on the subject of Papal infallibility is perfectly definite; and it is absolutely certain that the decision in regard to Galileo's teaching, shown now to have been unsound, does not in the slightest degree affect that doctrine. The decision was neither *ex-cathedra*, nor addressed to the whole Church." Mr. Mallock, another Protestant writer of repute, who became a Catholic shortly before his death, in his well-known book "Is Life Worth Living?" (ch. xii), observes: "This claim to infallibility is one, as we shall see when we understand its nature, that no study of ecclesiastical history can invalidate now, or can even promise to invalidate."

216. Remark. 1. We have no hesitation in acknowledging that the condemnations pronounced against the Florentine astronomer are to be deeply regretted, and that in issuing them the Roman Congregations erred. They were in the wrong in believing that Catholic Faith was endangered and the Holy Scripture contradicted by the Copernican system. In this they allowed themselves to be led astray by their excessive infatuation for Aristotle, and for the philosophical systems of his commentators, which were diametrically opposed to the Copernican theory. As to the part that Pope Urban VIII may have taken in this transaction, his responsibility is altogether individual, absolutely personal; it concerns him simply as a private theologian, but not as the Sovereign Pontiff, *speaking ex-cathedra,* that is, addressing his teaching to the Universal Church, to be believed and held by all as revealed truth under pain of sin.

2. Though the system of Copernicus was true, Galileo did not know how to defend it, and there is nothing strange that

the feeble proofs by which he tried to support it should have met with ardent opponents. There are, no doubt, some extenuating circumstances in the fact of Galileo's condemnation by the Holy Office of the Inquisition, which, if they do not entirely justify its action in the matter at issue, must, at least, afford to it some excuse. In fact, Galileo had not succeeded in bringing satisfactory proofs of the Copernican system, which he advocated so tenaciously. His conclusions were only happy and lucky guesses. Nay, not only was his reasoning from the flux and reflux of the tides wrong, and therefore failing to demonstrate the Copernican theory, but when a scientist greater than himself, Kepler, pointed out the true explanation of the tides, Galileo, instead of admitting his error, treated that explanation, which, even in our day, is held by the scientific world as the true one, with supreme contempt. As a matter of fact, the first strong mathematical proof of the truth of Copernicanism is found in the Principia of Newton, published in 1687, that is seventy-one years after the issue of the Index decree. After Newton came the astronomer Bradley (1727), with his discovery of the aberration of light as it travels from the distant stars to the earth, moving on in its orbit around the sun. This might be called a tangible, physical proof of the Copernican or heliocentric system, which holds that the sun is immovable, the center of the planetary system, and that our earth revolves on its axis every twenty-four hours, and thus produces the succession of day and night. In our own day, Foucault has made visible the diurnal motion of the earth by his well-known pendulum experiment. As the illustrious Jesuit writer Tiraboschi judiciously remarks in his History of Italian Literature: "In this we must admire the Providence of God in behalf of His Church. For at a time when the majority of theologians firmly believed the system of Copernicus to be contrary to holy Scripture, and nearly the whole scientific world held the Ptolemaic explanation of the motion of the heavenly bodies as true, while Galileo himself was unable to demonstrate the truth of the Copernican theory, God did not permit His Church to pronounce a solemn *ex-cathedra* judgment against a system which is now believed by

all to be true.'' In this connection let me call the reader's attention to the following remark. During the long lapse of nineteen centuries, in a long list of 261 Popes, the enemies of Papal Infallibility think they have discovered three instances —one instance for each six hundred years, one instance for each set of eighty-six Popes—where a Pope as Pope is said to have officially erred in his dogmatic teaching. Three instances they claimed to have discovered, that of Pope Liberius (A.D. 352); that of Pope Honorius I (A.D. 625), and lastly the case of Galileo, involving two Pontiffs, Urban VIII and Innocent X. Yet when we subject these three instances to the searching criticism of accurate history and precise theology, we find that even in these three cases the attack of our enemies falls ignominiously to the ground. The Church can never err in Faith, for she is the pillar and ground of the truth. (I Tim. 3, 15.) The Pope as Pope can never err in Faith, for he is that rock against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. (Part VII, ch. III.) Moreover, if the ecclesiastical tribunals were wrong, *the learned laity* had no reason to boast, for they also in great numbers fell into the same error, and desired and promoted much more vehemently than any of the clerics the condemnation of the new system. If theology is to be condemned on this account, science is none the less to be blamed. Secchi, the Jesuit astronomer, tells us that ''none of the real proofs of the earth's rotation upon its axis were known at the time of Galileo. Not until Réaumur (d. 1757) had ascertained the velocity of light, and Newton (d. 1729) the law of gravitation, was the scientific truth of the system established on a solid basis. Bacon in England, Descartes in France, Tycho Brahe in Denmark, and all the universities of Europe were contemporaneously skeptical of and prejudiced against Copernicanism, equally with the conscientious Biblical scholars who made up the tribunal of the Roman Inquisition.''

217. 3. Here we cannot help remarking that Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin and, in general, all the leaders of the so-called Reformation have not shown, after all, a better regard for the new Copernican system. Luther used to call Copernicus *a madman,* because, according to him, he attempted to

upset all the science of astronomy, though, according to the Scriptures, said the reformer, Joshua stopped the sun and not the earth. Kepler, a Lutheran minister, and distinguished astronomer, held the Copernican theory, and wrote a book to demonstrate its truth. Before this work could be printed, it was necessary to lay it before the Academical Senate of the University of Tübingen. How was it received? The unanimous decision of the Protestant divines composing this Senate was that the book contained a *damnable heresy,* because it contradicted the teaching of the Bible! Kepler was consequently obliged to flee his country, and where did he find refuge? First in the Jesuit College of Gratz in Austria, and after as Professor of Astronomy, Lutheran as he was, in the Catholic University of Bologna, a most honorable position assigned to him by the Pope! In view of these historical facts we may be allowed to conclude that, if the condemnation of Galileo, in the mind of our adversaries, proves the hostility of Catholicity to secular and scientific knowledge, the condemnation of Kepler, followed by his exile, proves just the same against Protestantism. But, as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, we shall soon see in the following pages and in Part X that no fair-minded historian can allege Galileo's case as a proof of her opposition to true progress and enlightenment in any field of human knowledge.

4. If Galileo, after the decree of 1616, had kept his promise, and had been more circumspect and reserved, he would not have been subjected to the condemnation of 1633, and it may be considered probable that it would not have taken long for the Copernican system to become popular, for it had as partisans and defenders among members of the clergy, a considerable number of the most celebrated men of learning of the time, though, as we have seen, they were unable to furnish apodictic proofs. Unfortunately, Galileo did not have the patience to wait for the time when he might see the inevitable triumph of his ideas. Though he had bound himself not to maintain the Copernican system, he wrote a new book, *"Dialogues about the Two Systems of the World,"* in which he exhibited the bad taste of attacking those among his opponents

who had shown the greatest kindness to him. The Pope in particular thought that he was designated in these dialogues by the ridiculous character Simplicio. Stung to the quick, the partisans of the Ptolemaic system demanded and obtained the condemnation of 1633.

219. 5. At the beginning of this discussion (n. 214) we stated that whilst the astronomer Copernicus had been teaching his theory in Rome itself without molestation, Galileo, on the contrary, was severely censured by the theologians of the Holy Office for advocating the same system. It is well to point out the reasons of these different proceedings on the part of the Roman authorities, which we find very ably stated both in Brownson's Works, vol. VI, pp. 543–47, and in "Popular Errors," by Lord Robert Montagu, pp. 174–80. What then are the real facts in the case? It appears that Galileo, by the manner in which he proclaimed his theory, his intemperate language in advocating it, and his attempt to reconcile it with the Scriptures, aroused the anger of many of his enemies, and was the cause of all his troubles. He was repeatedly advised to speak as a mathematician, to confine himself to the scientific proofs of his discoveries without meddling with the scriptural question. But with this Galileo was not satisfied. He insisted on two things—first, that his doctrine was scientifically demonstrated, and second, that it was supported by Scripture. But the Inquisitors, before whose tribunal the case was brought, decided against him; first, that the doctrine was not demonstrated and secondly, that it was not supported by Holy Scripture. Hence, it was again asked of him that he should be content to teach his doctrine as an hypothesis, not as a doctrine fully and satisfactorily demonstrated, and should confine himself to mathematical and astronomical arguments, without meddling with the scriptural bearings of the doctrine. Had he been content to pursue a straightforward course, as a scientific man, no complaint would ever have been entertained against him, and no official action would ever have been taken. His troubles then all arose from his rashness, from his insisting that the Roman authorities should sanction as demonstrated what was as yet only a probable hypothesis. The sole

difficulty then, concerning the great question at issue, grew out of Galileo's insisting on interpreting the passages of Scripture which seem to teach the geocentric theory—the immobility of the earth—so as to make them harmonize with the heliocentric, the immobility of the sun. The Roman theologians said to Galileo: "Go and establish your theory on scientific grounds, and when you have succeeded in demonstrating it as a science, it will be time enough to consider the scriptural question; but till then let the scriptural question alone." Had he followed this advice, which was recommended by his friends, and particularly by Cardinal Bellarmine, no difficulty would have occurred. But Galileo imprudently, and to the injury of his cause, abandoned the scientific grounds and defended himself by inventing new and dangerous rules of interpretation of Holy Writ, so as to get rid of those passages of the Bible, which had been alleged against him; and he went so far as to say that the mode of interpretation of the Scriptures had until that time been fallacious. Hence, instead of striving to prove the truth of the earth's rotary motion on scientific grounds, he drew arguments against his judges and rivals out of the books of Job and Joshua, losing himself at last in a perfect maze of theological subtleties, and all this absurd matter is contained in his own manuscripts still preserved.

219. "We may fairly presume that the strongest text of Holy Scripture, if not the only one, opposed, at least apparently, to the Copernican-Galileo system, is found in the Book of Josue 10, 12–14:

> Then Josue spoke to the Lord, in the day that he delivered the Amorrhite in the sight of the children of Israel, and he said before them: Move not, O sun, towards Gabaon, nor thou, O moon, towards the valley of Ajalon. And the sun and moon stood still, till the people revenged themselves of their enemies. Is not this written in the book of the just? So the sun stood still in the midst of the heaven, and hasted not to go down the space of one day. There was not before nor after so long a day, the Lord obeying the voice of a man, and fighting for Israel.

"Of course the strength of the objection is that not only Josue prayed with the belief that the sun and not the earth

really moved, but that God so received his prayer that the Holy Ghost declares that the sun was arrested in his course and *stood still.*

"Now a little reflection will reveal why God appears to connive at astronomical misconception. Josue immediately followed Moses in the years A.M. 2553 and B.C. 1447. The history of the Jewish people, while under Josue, is commonly believed to have been written by Josue himself. The common belief was, as it had been from the earliest times and as it remained practically till the seventeenth century of the Christian era, that the earth was the *centre* of the Universe, and that the sun was always in motion and truly rose in the morning and set in the evening. Even to this day we talk of the sun 'rising' in the east and 'setting' in the west.

"Now in the face of this universal belief (even were you to suppose Josue by inspiration knew better), what would the people have thought of Josue, if he had ordered the earth (which they regarded as immovable) and not the sun (which they regarded as always moving) to stand still? They would have laughed him to scorn or thought he had lost his senses. And God knew that; and so he dissimulated the physical inaccuracy, in order that the miraculous fact might become, at least, intelligible to the people.

"The old Ptolemaic system, which placed our earth immovable in the centre and supposed the sun and moon and stars to revolve around it every twenty-four hours, was not only the universally received system, but, it may be said, the only popular one, best adapted to vulgar capacities and the freest from palpable difficulties, when science was still in its infancy, and most consistent with common appearances and observations. The gross Israelites were so used to it that, had Moses, Josue, or any other inspired leader known anything of the heliocentric truth, yet it would have been improper, if not dangerous, to have so much as hinted at it. *How* God worked the miracle is beyond the necessary scope of this essay."—*Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* Nov. 1902.

Hence, to return to our subject, as far as Galileo's defense went, his theory of the motion of the earth was no more than

an hypothesis. It had no astronomical support. He made it rest on theological grounds, starting from new canons or rules in the interpretation of Scriptures. As these assumptions were not granted, his case necessarily fell to the ground. Could the Holy Office then be blamed for refusing to accept metaphorical interpretations of some passages of Scriptures, when there appeared no reason for abandoning the literal meaning, Galileo's theory being unsupported by evidence? In conclusion, if Galileo had been content to let theology alone, and to advance his theory simply as an astronomical hypothesis, the Holy Office would not have concerned itself with him any more than it did with Cardinal de Cusa and Copernicus. Still less would he have been hindered from working out reasonable proofs on astronomical grounds. When this was done in later years, the Church did not utter a word of opposition.

220. Let us add a useful remark concerning the Roman Congregations. They are subject to error, no doubt; but this does not mean that they have no authority and that their decrees can be disregarded. The father of a family may likewise in some cases be in the wrong, but he does not thereby lose the right to the obedience of his children. Established for the purpose of examining doctrinal questions and seeing to the preservation of Faith in its purity, these Congregations have the legitimate power to enact obligatory measures of discipline, *to interdict the teaching* of certain doctrines considered by them as erroneous, suspicious or dangerous. Such a prohibition is *a measure of prudence and has a force of law;* however, it is essentially *provisional* in its nature. Hence, if it be subsequently established that the danger does no longer exist, the prohibition is by that very fact removed or ceases of itself by default of an object to justify its enforcement, for such decisions, far from being dogmatic definitions, are simply disciplinary canons or measures naturally subject to change.

Conclusion. Therefore it evidently follows that the infallibility of the Church and of the Sovereign Pontiff is absolutely foreign to this question. There is reason on the con-

trary, as we have already observed, to acknowledge the providential assistance assured to the Church at a time when a number of theologians and the Pope himself thought the system of Copernicus contrary to the Sacred Scriptures, but God did not permit that the Sovereign Pontiff should issue a judgment *ex-cathedra* against it.

II.—Is the Church Opposed to Scientific Progress, and Was Galileo a Martyr to Science?

221. This question is much less important than the first. We shall therefore content ourselves with rapidly indicating the answer.

1. Far from being opposed to the progress of science, the Church has *always* encouraged intellectual activity; she has always favored the study and cultivation of philosophy, literature, science and the fine arts. We have already proven this above, and we shall again do so in Part X, the last of this course.

As to the special fact of a supposed systematic and malicious opposition to the progress of natural science, attributed to members of the higher clergy *at the time of Galileo,* it is openly contradicted by the shining proofs of sympathy and protection which scientific studies were then receiving at Rome; by the remarkable works of the Jesuits Clavius, Griemberger, Guldin, Scheiner, Grimaldi, Riccioli; of Canons, or members of religious orders, such as Copernicus, Castelli, Renieri, Cavalieri, Gassendi; by the enthusiastic reception given in the highest circles of the learned at Rome to the discoveries of Galileo; by his intimacy and active correspondence with a great number of prelates, such as Cardinals Barberini and Canti, Mgr. Dini, Mgr. Ciampoli, Archbishop Piccolomini, Mgr. Virginio Césarini.

Moreover, the system of Aristarchus of Samos (d. 150 B.C.), who taught that the earth moved around itself, whilst the sun remained immovable, was freely taught long previously, without the Church ever making any objection thereto. In 1435 Cardinal de Cusa revived this system; Canon Coper-

nicus, in his immortal work *De orbium celestium revolutionibus* (The revolution of the celestial orbs), had completed its exposition; his work had gained the support of Cardinal Schönberg and the approbation of Pope Paul III, who had accepted its dedication to himself; the new doctrine was taught in the Italian Universities and publicly professed in the presence of the Sovereign Pontiff Clement VII and no official or authorized protest against such teaching was ever heard within the Church before Galileo's time.

222. 2. In order to arouse more violently anti-religious hatred, attempts have been made to represent Galileo as a martyr to science, thrown into a dark dungeon and given up to the horrors of torture. The truth is that from 1616 to 1633 he peaceably continued his labors in his villa near Florence, writing the works we have mentioned. As to the second process against him, it is proven by the testimony of his contemporaries, most worthy of belief, and by the correspondence of Galileo himself, and the official report of 1633, that not only Galileo was not made a martyr, but that, properly speaking, he was never imprisoned, neither before nor after judgment. "We may challenge the fanatical enemies of the Church," says Gilbert in *La Revue des Questions Scientifiques* (Review of Scientific Questions), 1877, "to cite when and where, either before or after his condemnation, Galileo was subjected even to one hour's detention in a prison, properly so called." Whilst the prosecution was going on, he inhabited the palace of Nicolini, Ambassador of Tuscany, his devoted friend, who showered the kindest attentions upon him; then, on the eve of his trial, he was brought to the Minerva, where he remained from the 12th to the 30th of April, 1633, in the apartments of the fiscal Procurator of the Holy Office, with liberty to walk about at pleasure in the gardens attiguous to that residence, "to wander through its vast extent," as Galileo himself writes; and in this residence he was waited upon by his own servant and by those of the Ambassador. "As to my health, I am well, thanks to God and to the exquisite attentions of the Ambassador and his lady, who are most anxious to procure for me the greatest comfort." Having fallen ill, he was brought back,

by the orders of Urban VIII, to the palace of the Ambassador, where he could receive all his friends and was permitted to go out as he pleased. He remained in this brilliant *dungeon* (sic) until the 22d of June, the day of his condemnation. The sentence ordered that he be detained in the apartments of the Treasurer of the Holy Office, but the very next day this sentence was commuted to retirement in the palace of the Grand Duke of Tuscany; then, after a short stay with his devoted friend, the Archbishop of Siena, he passed the remainder of his life in his villa at Arcetri, near Florence, where he continued his scientific studies and received the visits of the learned and of the great personages of his time. He received a life-pension from the Papal treasury, and died, as he had lived, a very religious man, in the year 1642. His mortal spoils rest in the magnificent Basilica of Santa Croce, in Florence, adorned with a monument worthy of his genius.

223. 3. As to the torture, which, some pretend, was inflicted upon the illustrious astronomer, it is nowhere mentioned in the authentic records of the whole process, published in their entirety by M. de l'Epinois, records which relate all the proceedings, even in their minutest details. "Never," says this writer, "did Galileo in his most confidential correspondence, write a single line from which it could be inferred that he was subjected to torture. It is true that at the last interrogatory he was threatened with torture, but it is equally certain that this threat was and could be nothing more than a simple formality." And in fact, as it has been just stated, the threat was never carried out, and this especially because the inquisitorial procedure did not permit of torture being resorted to in the case of old men and infirm people. Now, Galileo was then fifty-nine years of age, and suffering from a chronic infirmity. Moreover, he himself declares, in a letter dated 1634, that he suffered nothing, either in his person or his honor. (See Gilbert, in the article cited above.)

It was only about the year 1770, that is, nearly 140 years after the process, that some Italian writers, hostile to the Church, began to spread the report that Galileo had been put to the torture, though even they declared the fact to be un-

likely. Now that we possess the official documents, this assertion, a mere calumny, has become absolutely untenable; it has in consequence been abandoned by all serious writers, no matter to what party they may belong. However, this can scarcely lead us to hope to see it disappear from writings hostile to religion, inspired by Voltaire's principle: "Be not afraid to utter lies, some of them will stick in the end."

Let us also remark in passing that the famous words: "*e pur si muove*" (and yet it [the earth] does move), ascribed to Galileo at the moment that he rose from his abjuration, appears absolutely improbable to those who have studied the proceedings. It was first invented at the end of the XVIIIth century, as has been shown by the mathematician Heis in the periodical *Gaea*, in 1868. Yet a class of writers will continue to palm off the incident as true, because it is likely to produce a fine effect in a novel or in a theatrical scene, where men will look in vain for anything like honest historical truth from men of that stamp.

224. The enemies of the Church must indeed be at a loss for arguments against her, since they constantly return, in spite of repeated refutations, to rehash their account of an error committed centuries ago by an ecclesiastical tribunal, which never claimed the privilege of infallibility. Have our civil tribunals, and even the Supreme Court of the United States, never committed any blunders? This error, the only one of its kind, was, however, common, as we have noticed, to a great number of learned men of that time, and was quite natural at the epoch when it occurred. The obstinate persistency of the adversaries of the Church in having recourse to this affair, now more than two hundred years old, as a powerful weapon against Catholicity, is all the more unreasonable since Galileo himself was neither a rebel nor a free-thinker. He was a staunch, sincere Catholic, fully convinced of the truth of his Faith; the hardest trials did not in the least weaken his religious belief, and he died piously in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Conclusion. Newspaper editors and magazine writers, who undertake to treat of the vexed question of Galileo and

his condemnation, are wont to display serious ignorance about it, apparently for want of familiarity with authentic documents. In former times Protestant controversalists used to enlarge on this subject as an irrefutable argument against the infallibility of the Catholic Church and of the Pope in particular. This line of argument is now obsolete, out of date, except among the profoundly ignorant or the furiously fanatical, a set of adversaries not as yet entirely extinguished either here in America or on the Continent. Catholic apologists have repeatedly shown that decrees of the Roman Inquisition are not dogmatical, but disciplinary; that not even the approval and confirmation by the Pope make them *ex-cathedra* definitions, to which alone infallibility is attributed. Hence no writer that respects himself will continue to argue against that ecclesiastical prerogative from Galileo's case. The Roman Congregations by their decrees issue decisions on current questions which do not pretend, of their own force, to be infallible and therefore irrevocable. Such decisions may at times be objectively incorrect. The Galileo incident is perhaps the most pronounced instance in history in which the specialist in science is nearer the truth than the authorities who pass sentence on his teaching. The range of Papal Infallibility is quite clearly defined, and does not come within touch of the case in question at all. This is not only a commonplace among Catholics, but is fully acknowledged by Protestant writers themselves. Thus Proctor, the distinguished astronomer quoted above, writes (Knowledge, vol. IX, p. 274): "The Catholic doctrine on the subject of Papal Infallibility is perfectly definite; and it is absolutely certain that the decision in regard to Galileo's teaching, shown now to have been unsound, does not, in the slightest degree, affect the doctrine of infallibility either of the Pope or of the Church. The decision was neither *ex-cathedra,* nor addressed to the whole Church; in not one single point does the case come in conflict with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as defined by the Vatican Council." (1870.)

Another Protestant, Karl von Gebler, in his work "Galileo

and the Roman Curia'' writes to the same effect. ''We grant that the two Congregations of the Index and the Inquisition, with the two Popes, Urban VIII and Innocent X, who sanctioned and promulgated their decrees, were in error; but no one ever held that the decisions of the Roman Congregations were in themselves infallible, even when approved by the Pope, unless specially set forth by the Pope himself with all the conditions required for an *ex-cathedra* definition.'' Our defense on this point lies simply in the fact that the Pope's approval of the acts of a Congregation does not raise them to an *ex-cathedra* definition, for which several other conditions pointed out above (n. 121) are absolutely required.

Not a few biographers held that Galileo brought all the mischief upon himself by dabbling in theology and the Scripture: that had he confined himself to his mathematical and astronomical studies, and left those questions alone, he would not have come to grief. A close investigation, however, on the origin of this conflict, justifies us in stating that the scriptural controversy was first raised by his opponents and that he was actually dragged into that discussion in self-defense. His adversaries, stubborn adherents to the Aristotelian school, when they found themselves worsted in arguments by Galileo's appeal to scientific facts, resorted to a more dangerous weapon, which they wielded with deadly effect. But their radical mistake, which led them to an erroneous verdict, consisted in this that they took a traditional interpretation of Scripture as an authority not only in theology, but also in science. Yet, notwithstanding this condition of things, if Galileo had heeded the kind advice of his friend and protector, Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J., and confined himself to astronomical arguments, besides steering clear of all inquisitorial troubles, he would have achieved an easy triumph over all his opponents. That Galileo's conduct as a son of the Church was not what it ought to have been, is cordially acknowledged by Whewel (Inductive Sciences, p. 535) who tells us that ''Leibnitz, Guizot, Spittler, Eichorn, Ramner, Ranke, and almost all persons who have studied the facts, have at last done justice to the Church that Galileo trifled with authority

to which he professed to submit. After all the leniency exhibited to him by Pope Urban VIII, who even granted to him a life pension, Galileo wrote the Dialogues, in which he apparently exposed to ridicule his principal pontifical benefactor; a work calculated to discredit the authority of Scripture in the minds of ordinary readers. In conclusion, not to justify the erroneous decision of the condemnatory decree of the Roman Congregation, but only to extenuate, in some degree, their conduct in this vexatious matter, the readers should bear in mind the following remarks. Had Galileo really and convincingly proved the truth of the Copernican system, which he advocated before the tribunal of the Inquisition? Muller, a celebrated astronomer, answers negatively. Three, he writes, were the proofs he adduced:

1st. From the phases of Venus and Mercury.

2nd. From the sun's spots.

3rd. From the tides.

Galileo had not one apodictic argument; but he alleged many positively wrong statements, and facts, which were all painfully clear to the scientists of the time. Hence many of them said: "Whether the earth moves or not, is a question undecided for the moment; but it certainly is not demonstrated to do so by the fallacious arguments of Galileo." This verdict is in perfect accord with the judgment of Angelo Secchi, the Jesuit astronomer, who writes: "None of the real proofs of the earth's rotation upon its axis were known at the time of Galileo." (See above, n. 216.)

CHAPTER VI

THE MASSACRE ON THE EVE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY

225. Historical Account. In 1572, on the night preceding the feast of St. Bartholomew, August 24th, Charles IX, yielding to the solicitations of *Catherine de Medici,* his mother, gave orders to massacre in Paris Admiral Coligny and the other principal leaders of the Huguenots residing in that city,

or who had lately arrived to attend the marriage of the king of Navarre with Margaret de Valois. The Parisian populace had for a long time borne intense hatred against the Huguenots; it had not forgotten the pillaging of the capital which the reformed leaders had promised to the mercenary troops recruited in Germany. Hence, once inflamed with fury at the sight of blood shed during that terrible night by the emissaries of the king, it arose in its turn, sought out the Huguenots and fell upon them, without anyone having sufficient authority to stop the carnage. From the 25th of August until the 30th of October, similar massacres were perpetrated in several other cities of the kingdom. We are not surprised that under the strain of terrible provocation on the part of the Huguenots, this lamentable instance of cruel retaliation should have occurred.

Religion Had No Part Whatever in the Massacre

226. It is not for us to examine this event from *the political point of view*. It will be found treated with great care in the excellent work of Kervyn de Lettenhove, "*Les Huguenots et les Gueux*" (The Huguenots and the Beggars). The minute researches of this writer, who advances nothing without citing documents to substantiate his assertions, throw abundant light upon this mournful drama. Our duty is to establish the fact that the Catholic religion has been made responsible for these massacres without a shred of proof to justify the atrocious charge. If there is in the whole range of history anything shown most clearly by the most incontestable documentary evidence it is that *the massacre of St. Bartholomew was a purely political event and that religion had no part in it, either as adviser or as agent*. No cardinal, no bishop, no priest took any part in the deliberations, at which the massacre was decided upon, no more than in its execution. The author of *Annales Politiques* (Political Annals) testifies that no ecclesiastic was in the Council of the king, or in the least cognizant of the contemplated massacre. He also asserts that it was from beginning to end a merely political expedient. In the face of such testimony, how, with any show of justice, can any

blame be insinuated against the Church? On the contrary, undeniable records prove that the Church only interfered to save the victims. The Bishop of Lisieux, for instance, succeeded in arresting the massacre which had begun in his diocese; at Lyons the Archbishop opened his palace as a refuge to more than 300 Calvinists; and at Toulouse, Bordeaux, Bourges and other cities, the bishops and other ecclesiastics succeeded in their indefatigable efforts to save many persons from the effects of the king's orders and from the fury of the populace.

227. It is true that at the news of the terrible *coup d'état*, Gregory XIII ordered solemn thanks to God, that he went himself in procession from the Church of St. Mark to that of St. Louis of the French and caused a commemorative medal to be struck. But we now know perfectly well what was the true and sole purpose of those demonstrations. The Court of the Valois had officially informed the Pope, that a conspiracy directed against the throne and life of Charles IX had happily been discovered and stamped out. A similar notification was sent to the different provinces of the kingdom and to all the courts of Christendom. Therefore the "Te Deum" was sung in the French Church at Rome, under French auspices, as an act of international comity in consequence of the first report. Those were not the days of telegraphy and telephones, airplanes and radio broadcasting. Later on, the truth became known in all its details, and the Sovereign Pontiff in his discourses and by his Bulls publicly expressed his horror at the crime.

We cannot hope, however, to see the enemies of the Church change their tactics. In spite of repeated refutations made even by learned Protestant historians they will continue to ascribe to religious hatred the vengeance perpetrated by the ministers of Catherine de Medici, and the better to excite passionate feelings, they will persist, with Voltaire and a celebrated modern opera, to mingle together the Crucifix and the dagger, and point out the Cardinal Charles de Lorraine, who at that time was *in Rome*, in the act of blessing *in Paris* the daggers destined for the massacre.

Meyerbeer's celebrated opera "The Huguenots" has an intensely dramatic scene. It pictures the Cardinal of Lorraine blessing the French daggers, that were to do the bloody work of St. Bartholomew's day. That scene, one of the most impressive in the brilliant opera, has had much to do with the quite general Protestant belief that the Catholic Church instigated, and, through its agents, carried out the slaughter of Protestants in France that was begun in Paris on August 24, 1572.

From what historical authority, from what record or tradition, did the scribe who wrote the libretto of "The Huguenots" take the inspiration for this great stage picture? No historian of that time, Protestant or Catholic, made mention of any such occurrence. The written record is that at the time of the massacre and for some time before and some time after, the Cardinal of Lorraine was far from France: he was in Rome attending a conclave of cardinals for the election of a Pope. The real chief culprit was Catherine de Medici, wife of Henry II. This Florentine astute woman had but one passion and that was for power. She shrank from no bloodshed if she conceived it to be in line with her purpose. Catherine's courier conveying to the Pope the false report of the tragedy had beaten the courier of the papal nuncio in the race from Paris to St. Peter's. Hence the reason of the Te Deum sung in the French church by order of Gregory XIII. (See "Two and Two Make Four," by Bird S. Coler—Chapter III, The Daggers That Were Not Blessed.)

228. Remarks. 1. It would perhaps not be a useless task to show that *the number of the victims* of the massacre has been grossly *exaggerated*. It is impossible to know the whole truth in that regard; accordingly the number varies with each historian; it has, however, been established with a considerable degree of probability that the number was not over 2,000. Cardinal Hergenröther, whose authority as a writer it is difficult to challenge, puts it between two and three thousand at most. This is an enormous number, no doubt, but it is far from the 30,000 victims spoken of by some authors and especially from the 100,000 boldly asserted by Péréfixe. What con-

fidence indeed can be placed in historical accounts when at every step palpable contradictions are met with? The martyrology of the Calvinists, published by the sect in 1582, speaks of 15,168 victims, but it names only 786; and yet it was evidently the author's interest to increase the number if he had been able to do it with impunity. Moreover, he wrote at a time when the impression of the awful crime was yet livid and its memory fresh; and as he collects names of very little importance, it may easily be believed that he has forgotten nothing, and has gathered together everything to swell the number of his so-called martyrs and the volume of the martyrology.

2. Let us further remark that it has not been at all proved that the massacre was *long premeditated;* the contrary even seems to be well established. The following few words sum up the opinion of Kervyn de Lettenhove on this subject: "That Catherine de Medici carefully planned *the assassination of Coligny* there can be no doubt. Assuredly there existed in her mind *a secret desire* to get rid of all whom she believed formidable, and especially of the Huguenots, who at that moment were truly exciting in her the greatest apprehension. According to her own expression, she wished to take advantage of a favorable occasion, *del caso.* Nothing further can be stated. All contemporary testimony precludes premeditation as to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which, in presence of an odious conspiracy, was only a means of *defense* yet more odious but deemed necessary." (Vol. II, ch. xxxii.) The same historian concludes that chapter by saying: "Such has been the sanguinary day of St. Bartholomew, which, though often inaccurately examined in its causes and incidents, adds a new disgrace, more odious than all the others, to the ambition and craft of Catherine de Medici. A few hours sufficed for the Huguenots to pass in history from the role of conspirators to that of victims, and the Queen Mother, at a moment when all lawful weapons were in her hand, thought only of using those which were to dishonor her memory for all centuries to come."

229. 3. We refer to the terrible provocation on the part of the Huguenots, not indeed to justify or palliate the awful massacre perpetrated by the emissaries of the king and the

enraged populace, both in Paris and in the Provinces, but simply to account in some manner for the summary revenge dealt on their enemies by a provoked people. In those unhappy times the Calvinist Protestants of France, called Huguenots, were perpetrating, as Grotius tells us, every manner of impiety and sacrilege, wantonly wounding the holiest feelings and deepest convictions of the nation. They pillaged, desecrated and defaced the churches, ruined monasteries, killed priests, dishonored the virgins of Christ, and slaughtered Catholics who refused to renounce their Faith. The images of the Saints were disfigured, the sacred vessels, the relics of the Saints were broken, and the Mother of God was blasphemed, the most blessed Sacrament was profaned in the most horrid manner by roving bands of Protestant marauders. After capturing La Rochelle, which they made their chief stronghold, they appealed to the Protestants of Germany and to Queen Elizabeth of England for aid in men, money and arms, which they readily obtained, and which they meant to employ to dethrone the legitimate king and usurp the crown of France. With these events before her eyes what wonder that Catholic France should view with alarm the violent efforts of a party who did not disguise their intention of uprooting the national religion, and whose acts were of so aggressive and formidable a character, directed to the destruction both of the Church and of the dynasty. Dr. Littledale, a bitter enemy of the Roman Church, whom he accuses of cruelty and intolerance, in his lecture entitled "Innovations" (1868, p. 19), speaks as follows: "Everybody knows there was a horrible massacre of the French Protestants on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572; but few know that the atrocities which the Protestants themselves, ten years before, had committed at Beaugency, Montauban, Nîmes, Montpellier, Grenoble and Lyons, equalled, if they did not exceed that terrible crime. Again, I do not suppose there are ten people in this room who ever heard of the Nones of Haarlem in Holland. William the Silent, Prince of Orange, the famous leader of the revolt of the Netherlands against Spain, posted a large body of soldiers around the Square of Haarlem one Corpus Christi Day, when

the Catholics were all at church. As soon as service was over, and the congregation streamed out, they were hemmed in and massacred by the Protestant soldiery. A slaughter of not much less atrocity signalized the introduction of Lutheranism into Sweden by the butcherly tyrant Gustavus Vasa (d. 1560)."

Such was Protestant toleration, Protestant liberty of conscience, Protestant piety and charity, when the odious Calvinistic heresy, embraced by the Huguenots, first appeared in Catholic France and in other countries of Northern France.

CHAPTER VII

THE CRUSADES

230. Historical Notice. Numerous pilgrimages had made the Holy Land dear to the Catholic world. The unjust cruel treatments to which the pilgrims were subjected by the anti-Christian, barbarous rulers, the Turks, became known throughout Europe, and were in a great degree instrumental in arousing the enthusiasm of Christendom for the defense and rescue of the land where the divine Savior, Jesus Christ, achieved the Redemption of Mankind. The first to respond to the wide spread appeals were the Supreme Pontiffs Sylvester II, St. Gregory VII, and Urban II.

Seven were the general Crusades organized and marched to Palestine within the years 1095 and 1283, when the last expedition under Charles of Anjou closed the period of the chivalrous combats against Islam, the sworn enemy of Christian nations.

First Crusade, 1095–1099

Under Pope Urban II.

Preached by Peter the Hermit. Chief leader, Godfrey de Bouillon, Duke of Lorraine, who became first King of Jerusalem.

Second Crusade, 1147–1149

Under Pope Eugenius III.

Preached by St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Chief leaders, Louis VII of France, and Conrad III of Germany.

Third Crusade, 1189–1192

Under Pope Clement III.

Preached by his Legate, William, Archbishop of Tyre. Chief leaders, Frederick Barbarossa, Richard Lion Heart, Philip Augustus of France and King William of Sicily. This Crusade was fought against the Sultan Saladin, who had united all the Moslem forces under his command.

Fourth Crusade, 1197–1204

Under Pope Innocent III.

Preached by Fulk of Neuilly. Chief leaders, Conrad, Archbishop of Mainz, Boniface of Montferrat, Baldwin of Flanders, Dandolo, Doge of Venice. Greek parties, Emperor Isaac Angelus, Alexius III, IV, V.

Fifth Crusade, 1217–1221

Proclaimed by the IV General Council of the Lateran and Popes Innocent III, Honorius III and Gregory IX.

Preached by James de Vitry and Cardinal Robert de Curzon. Chief leaders, Andrew, King of Hungary, Leopold, Duke of Austria, and John Brienne, Titular King of Jerusalem.

Sixth Crusade, 1248–1252

Under Pope Innocent IV.

Chief leaders, Louis IX, the Saint, his brothers and William Longsword, Earl of Salisbury.

Seventh Crusade, 1270–1283

Under Popes Gregory X, Innocent V, Hadrian V and John X, Nicholas III, Martin IV.

Chief leaders, Louis IX, the Saint, who died at Tunis of the plague, his son, Philip the Bold, Prince Edward of England and Charles of Anjou.

Spanish Crusades

The national Spanish Crusades against the armed invaders, the Saracens and the Moors of Africa had their beginning in the year 1061, and ended with the conquest of Granada, 1276.

231. We might dispense with treating this question; it is enough to read any impartial historian to find the justification of these warlike expeditions, which display Christian society in all its splendor of religious heroism. Hence, the Church is justly proud of having been the inspirer of those brave and noble undertakings. However, we shall say a few words concerning them and briefly prove:

1. That according to the principles of *justice* or in their motives, the Crusades were perfectly right and justifiable.

2. That *in fact,* far from having given rise to the disastrous consequences sometimes attributed to them, they produced, on the contrary, the most happy results.

I.—Lawfulness of the Crusades

232. Their purpose was just, generous and civilizing. Mahomet had inspired his followers with the ardor of proselytism by the sword. Their fanaticism, at first victorious in Spain, then arrested by the valiant sword of Charles Martel, even dreamt of the conquest of the West and the destruction of civilization. The emperors of Constantinople were calling upon the Christians of the West to hasten to protect the last bulwark of Europe, and the Church added her exhortations to this pressing appeal. After Sylvester II and Sergius IV, who had lifted a generous voice in favor of the Christians of the Holy Land, St. Gregory VII wrote to the Emperor in 1074: "The Christians beyond the sea, who are afflicted with unheard of disasters and daily massacred like vile beasts, have sent to me their appeal in the excess of their misfortunes, entreating me to help my brethren by all the means in my power, so that the Christian religion may not be destroyed in our day, which God forbid."

In answering the appeal of Urban II and Peter the Hermit at the Council of Clermont (1095), the Christian princes felt

themselves assured that they were obeying the will of God. Up to that time they had only defended themselves; they now decided to carry the war into the very heart of Islamism. This was their duty and their right, for all the religious and social rights of the European nations were threatened by the Mahometans. Should Europe have quietly waited until the shame and scourge of slavery had overwhelmed it? Should each Christian nation allow itself to be oppressed, in place of making with all the others a holy league against the common enemy? "When we blame these expeditions," says the learned de Guignes in "*Memoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et des belles-lettres*" (Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres), it is because we have not sufficiently reflected upon the condition of affairs. The Mussulmans, after having seized Syria by force, had rendered themselves masters of Africa, then of Spain, and of all the islands of the Mediterranean, from which they constantly ravaged the coasts of Italy. Through Spain and Corsica they penetrated into the Southern provinces of France; they pillaged all our ships met with on the sea. Constantinople was a powerful barrier against their invading hordes, and if they had been able to overthrow it, as they endeavored to do, all Europe would be threatened and run the risk of falling into their power. By attacking them in the center of their empire, there was the hope of greatly weakening their power, as it was really done; they thereby received a blow from which they never recovered."

233. "In the wars undertaken against the Mahometans," says Father Broeckaert, "we behold the Papacy at the apogee of its political influence, and Christian society in all the splendor of religious heroism. It is for this two-fold reason that the Crusades have been, on the part of the enemies of the Church, the object of the most bitter criticisms. The glory of this age of Faith offends them, and the renown, which the Popes gained therefrom, irritates them: therefore what are the Crusades, in their opinion, but useless, ridiculous, and unjust enterprises? Although these attacks, thanks to Catholic writers, have lost their force, they have not entirely ceased,

and the sons of the Crusaders are still obliged to defend their ancestors against the children of Voltaire." (The Fact Divine, p. 250.)

We will point out the principal considerations that may be adduced in favor of the Crusades.

In every question of war, the fundamental point is the lawfulness of the motives which caused it to be undertaken. Now, the Crusades had for their cause not only the ordinary legitimacy of a violated right or of an invaded territory, but also the legitimacy of all the religious and social rights threatened by the Mahometans. It is not necessary to dwell here upon the idea of the conquest of the tomb of Jesus Christ; this was a special object proposed to the piety of the Faithful; but the war was between two religions and two civilizations. If the sect founded by Mahomet in 632, had only been a sect, if the Koran had only been a crude rhapsody of ridiculous prophecies and vague morality, Christianity would have employed against it only the ordinary means of the apostolate and charity; but Mahomet had inspired his adherents with the idea of propagating their religion with the sword, and his fanatical followers were planning the conquest of the West and the destruction of civilization; against such enemies war was truly *holy,* in virtue of the most sacred principles of men and Christians."

II.—Results of the Crusades

233. One of their principal results was to strengthen the influence of the Church and increase the prestige and authority of the Roman Pontiffs, who always occupied a commanding position in the holy wars, which were proclaimed and preached in their name and carried on under their auspices. At their call the great Christian monarchs took the Cross and mustered their armies. Warriors enrolled under the sacred banner, received from the Popes extraordinary privileges acknowledged by their Rulers, and special spiritual graces designed to secure their eternal salvation particularly available for all that died in the defense of that noblest of causes, the deliver-

ance of the holy places from the dominion of their usurpers. The Papal legates represented the authority of the Holy See in the armies. In short, the Popes were the protectors of the Crusaders, the defenders of their families, and the guardians of their property. The assertion that the clergy were enriched by the Crusades is not borne out by facts. From the Second Crusade the clergy had to bear the heaviest burden of the expenses. Tribute was freely levied on the clergy by the Popes, who were themselves the heaviest contributors to the crusading funds. The so-called Saladin tithe entailed at times positive hardship on the clergy. "Michaud, the well-known author of the History of the Crusades, estimates that in the space of 188 years the clergy paid more money towards the Holy Wars than would have been required to purchase all their property." From Guggenberger's "General History of the Christian Era."

234. The Crusades did not completely attain the immediate end for which they were undertaken, it is true, but as de Maistre says: "No single Crusade succeeded, but taking all of them together they succeeded." To form a true judgment of these grand expeditions, we must consider them in all their bearings, without stopping at abuses and faults, which are the effects of human passions and which are met with in all wars. See in the panegyric of St. Louis, King of France, the eloquent passage in which Mgr. Pie enumerates *the happy effects* of the Crusades. We shall note the following:

1. The conquest of Constantinople, and the enslavement of the East by the Mussulmans, delayed for four hundred years.

2. The West and Christian civilization saved from the brutalizing domination of Islam. The Ottoman power, which for centuries threatened to invade the whole world, was so weakened and fatally wounded that it now exists only through the sufferance of Christendom and the political jealousy of European rulers. This is so true that, should the European potentates agree on the partition, this fact alone would sound the death knell of the Turkish Empire.

3. The nations and people of Europe freed from the

calamities and disasters, which they were inflicting upon each other, through the discords and unceasing warfare continually waged by princes, nobles and towns against each other. The passion for combat, which animated every knight, found a noble field for its display; ceasing to war upon each other, the Christian warriors united their efforts against the common enemy.

4. The condition of the people was improved; serfs and vassals freed by thousands; cities and towns acquired rights and privileges that put a curb on the arbitrary and tyrannical powers of the feudal lords.

5. The advantages derived therefrom for agriculture, commerce, science, letters and art; and who will deny that these expeditions prepared the splendid centuries of Leo X and Louis XIV?

6. The spiritual good which they produced. "Can the Christian," exclaims Mgr. Pie, "confine his view to the present and forget the horizon which opens beyond the grave? What matters it to me, destined as I am, for the other and better life, what matters it that the Crusades should not meet with approval from the cold, selfish and avaricious calculations of modern economists, when the saintly Abbot of Clairvaux assures me that he learned from heaven that this employment of worldly resources, styled in the Gospel the mammon of iniquity, procured for millions of Frenchmen the permanent treasures of supreme beatitude? It was not long before they understood that their terrestrial country had not been impoverished and that their celestial home was enriched for all time by being peopled with millions of souls. Men of the present, you speak to me of figures, and I, a priest of eternity, I know of only one number that can interest me and which is uppermost in my thoughts, and that is the number of the elect that are to be eternally happy."

All these advantages fully compensate for the defeats met with by the Crusaders through their dissensions and rivalries and because of the perfidy of the Greeks. Their reverses are attributable in part to the evil conduct of a great number of Crusaders, and in part to the treasonable behavior of the

Greeks. Had it not been for the Greek schism (75) the Church of the East would have been able by herself either to convert and incorporate the Arabs, as the Church of the West had done with the barbarians, or to drive them away from her bosom. But ambition and jealousy, which had separated her from Rome, the center of unity, rendered her faithless to the cause of God.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WARS CALLED WARS OF RELIGION

235. The name *The Wars of Religion* is generally applied to those wars which took place in France, between Catholics and Protestants, during the second half of the sixteenth century. They generally include many wars; the signal for the first was the massacre of Vassy (1552), occasioned by the Huguenots of Nîmes; the third ended by the conversion of Henry IV and the edict of Nantes. We also include under this name the wars of 1625 and 1626, under Louis XIII, and the wars of the Cevennes or the Camisards under Louis XIV. All these wars have afforded a fruitful theme for the declamations of Protestants and unbelievers. Nothing, however, is easier than to justify the Church in relation to these wars.

1. The Church has never admitted the *Mahometan* principle of imposing her doctrine by force. She has contented herself with protecting *her acquired rights* either in the society which she had formed, or over the persons who had made to her *a promise of fidelity.*

2. The wars of religion, dating from the thirteenth century, are the result of heresy and of its revolt against *the constituent principles of society.* The heretics did not content themselves with discussing; they committed the most barbarous acts against persons and property; they were the enemies of order and civilization, and the kings were obliged to repress them by armed force (n. 197).

3. That in these just and necessary wars on the part of Christian princes there should have been at times cruel re-

prisals was a deplorable thing, but it was difficult to prevent them. It would in such case be supremely unjust to impute these excesses to the Church, whose spirit is totally opposed to them.

4. Let us add, with the eminent French jurist, Montesquieu (d. 1755): "It is to reason wrongfully against religion to make the enumeration of the evils that it has produced (or rather of which it has been the occasion or pretext) if at the same time we do not take into account the good which it has procured; if I were to relate all the evils that have been caused by monarchies, by civil laws, by republican governments, I should have to say dreadful things."

It is certain that, if this method of reasoning employed to attack religion were legitimate, we should logically end by condemning and destroying all institutions, royalty, the magistracy, the army, and society itself. For if we peruse the history of all times, we shall find a dreadful succession of crimes to excite our horror; we shall see that civil dissensions and wars have ever covered the earth with blood. Even in our day, in spite of the general mitigation of manners and principles, blood does not cease to flow upon the battlefield. Would it be logical to conclude that it is necessary to abolish society, and that it would be preferable for men to live in the forests and to wander about like wild animals? This, however, is what would have to be done if turning our eyes from the good produced by an institution excellent in its nature, we were to confine ourselves to considering only *the abuse that can be made of it.* It is not in this way that a man of sense acts; in considering the wars of which religion has been the occasion, he pities humanity which he sees capable of abusing that which is most sacred on earth; but he is far from forgetting the innumerable and wonderful benefits which mankind owes to religion and to the virtues which it has caused men to practice. See Confer. of Frayssinous (n. 201).

CHAPTER IX

THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES

236. This act of Louis XIV has also been the theme of declamations, absurd, it is true, but which strike the mind of the ignorant, and which pass from mouth to mouth without due examination. The principles hitherto established as to the relations which should exist between State and Church (nn. 134–140), and the facts attested by impartial history, deprive this accusation of all force and value. We shall endeavor to be brief. For details the reader can consult the work of Léon Aubineau: *"De la révocation de l'édit de Nantes"* (The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes), and *"La vie de Madame de Maintenon"* (The Life of Madame de Maintenon), by de Noailles, and other works of reference to be quoted at the conclusion of this VIIIth Part.

237. Historical Notice. By his edict of 1598, first published in the city of Nantes, Henry IV had granted to the Huguenots not only liberty of conscience, but also considerable liberty of worship and many great privileges. He also stipulated their right to be admitted to all the civil offices and to all the employments in the kingdom; the annual payment of a sum of 140,000 francs for the support of ministers of the reformed religion; the retention by the reformers of all the fortresses, towns and castles which they then held, to the number of one hundred and twenty, the King having engaged to pay their garrisons. It was nothing less, as Henry IV himself said to Sully, than the creation of a republican state in the midst of France. In the words of Guizot (d. 1874), it was equivalent to establishing a Calvinistic republic in the heart of the royal dynasty of Catholic France.

By an edict of the 22d of October, 1685, Louis XIV radically changed the situation. He *revoked* the freedom of *worship* and the above-mentioned privileges, whilst still leaving to Protestants freedom of *conscience*.

Let us remark that, especially in this case, there is a

notable difference between these two expressions. *Conscience* is altogether an *inward* affair, which necessarily is beyond all physical or external repression, whilst *worship* suggests something outward and sensible. When liberty of *conscience alone* is granted to a sect, public worship, meetings, and proselytism are not permitted. The adherents can simply live in peace in that country, without being molested as to their religious opinions and without being obliged to take part in practices of worship different from their own. Liberty of *worship* goes further; it permits the open profession and the unrestricted practice of any worship; it allows the organization of its clergy, its ceremonies and religious practices.

Was the edict of 1685 legitimate? Was it expedient or opportune? What are we to think about its execution and its results? These are the three questions which we are about to answer.

I. Was the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes Legitimate?

238. The legitimacy of the edict of Louis XIV is easy to demonstrate. For even were we to see in the Edict of Nantes a *compact* properly so-called, it was certainly a *revocable* compact. The Calvinistic Protestant Grotius (d. 1645) admits it in these terms: "Let the so-called reformers understand clearly, these acts of *tolerance* are not treaties, but royal edicts issued for the general good, and subject to revocation, whenever the general good requires the king to do so." Louis XIV had therefore the right to revoke the edict of his predecessor.

II. Was the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes Expedient or Opportune?

239. This is an *historical* question, which, properly speaking, does not concern the subject of the present controversial work. Let us, however, say a few words about the matter.

When we attentively study the condition of France and that of Henry IV in 1598, we ask ourselves, could that king be blamed for acting as he did? Thanks to his edict, he was able to give peace to the kingdom and to establish order in all

parts of the public administration. We know, moreover, that he intended to withdraw, little by little, the clauses of the edict which created a State within a State. Louis XIII, the Prime Minister Richelieu, and Louis XIV (before 1685) carried out the intentions of Henry IV; by skillful and successive measures they reduced the liberties granted to the sectaries to such an extent that in 1685 the total revocation was effected without difficulty; it was a ripe fruit which fell naturally from the tree. Foreseen by all and prepared from afar, the revocation did not provoke serious opposition. Moreover, the conduct of the Huguenots themselves amply justified the rigorous measures taken against them. Rising in revolt against the State, after having rebelled against the Church, they had been guilty of a multitude of profanations. Everywhere they had broken up crosses and images, burnt churches and convents, and by this conduct they had aroused against themselves the whole nation, which was profoundly Catholic. "These outrages, which were one of the principal characteristics of the Reformation, were also," says de Noailles, "one of the principal causes of the general repulsion which that new creed inspired." Then, the danger which was found in the principles of Protestantism, the revolutionary risings which it had excited in Germany, the seditious character assumed at an early date by its assemblies, all these things tended to impel the Parliament and the Government to protect the nation against these heretics. Besides, three rebellions in less than ten years, under frivolous pretexts, were more than sufficient to open the eyes of even the most blind. The Protestant writer Buckle, in his History of Civilization, referring to this subject, says: "The Huguenot Protestants soon learned to despise that great edict of Nantes, by which their liberties were secured, and proceeded to rob and murder that very party to whom they owed a toleration which had been reluctantly conceded by the prejudices of the age. They were not content to exercise their own religion unless they could also trouble the religion of others. At La Rochelle, which for importance was the second city in the kingdom, they would not permit the Catholics to have a single church in which to

celebrate divine worship, though Catholicity had been for centuries the sole religion in France, and was still the religion of an enormous majority of Frenchmen."

The act of Louis XIV then was not sudden nor accomplished without due consideration. It was long thought over, and the king saw himself *encouraged* by public opinion to come to this decision. "The revocation of the edict of Nantes," according to Capefigue, "was a patient work, developed with particular solicitude and prudence." See *"Histoire de Louis XIV"* (History of Louis XIV), by the same author, chapter xxiv; in it will be found the plan and the intentions of the king, as written by the king himself.

III. What is to Be Thought of Its Execution and Its Results?

240. **A.** As to the first point, impartial historians generally agree in blaming some of the measures adopted; they acknowledge, however, that the king cannot be held responsible for this, except for having confided in agents who failed to fulfill his formal intentions. As to the clergy, they had no part in the revocation except in rendering more humane the measures that accompanied it. Mr. Weiss, a Protestant writer of great ability, in his history of the French Huguenot Refugees, contends that religion had little or nothing to do with the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and that the king acted from political and social motives. Before concluding this subject, we cannot help acquainting our readers with the following judicious remarks of O. Brownson, vol. X, pp. 380–381. "If the Huguenots of France had demeaned themselves as loyal subjects, if they had been contented with holding and practicing their heresy for themselves, and had suffered Catholics in their neighborhood to practice unmolested the true religion, the State might have permitted them to damn their souls as they insisted on doing; but when they abused the liberty secured to them by the edict of Nantes to disturb the peace of the State, to persecute Catholics, to sack and burn Catholic villages, to destroy Catholic churches and convents, to murder women and children, or to carry them away captiv. ; it was the right, it was the duty of the civil authority to

intervene and reduce them to subjection; for the first duty of every civil Government is to protect the Church and maintain the freedom of religion—of religion we say, not of heresy and infidelity, which, as far as we could ever learn, have not, and never had, and never can have, any rights, being, as they undeniably are, contrary to the law of God. After providing for the freedom of religion and fully securing to everyone the right to profess and practice it without let or hindrance from any quarter, it may be wise, just and even necessary for the Government to leave heresy and infidelity to take care of themselves, and to go for what they are worth. We are no friends to severity, and we are perfectly well aware of the folly of trying to force men into heaven. God Himself forces no man to receive His bounty, but leaves all men to their freedom (n. 159) subject, however, to the penalty of eternal damnation for choosing wrong; but we should be wanting in common sense if we did not recognize the right and duty of the civil Government, when heresy and infidelity undertake to propagate themselves by carnal weapons, by fire and sword, to intervene, and by physical force, if necessary, to coerce them into peaceable subjects and harmless neighbors."

A truly deplorable effect of the edict of Louis XIV, which we must notice, was the *hypocrisy and dissimulation* of Protestant families, who became *outwardly and feignedly Catholic*. These families carried on against Religion and the State a constant opposition, secret at first, but which, in later times, during the eighteenth century, helped to ensure the triumph of philosophism. It was from 1685 particularly that the free-thinkers, plotting with secret Protestants and the Jansenists, began that fierce warfare, which ended in the suppression of the Society of Jesus and the outbreak of the French Revolution.

241. **B.** As to the material results of the revocation, it is difficult to estimate them. There is no exact account of the losses occasioned by the emi[illegible]on of a number of French subjects who abandoned their country. The figures, which were brought forward in later times, are manifestly exaggerated. Moreover, in comparison with the enormous

losses in money and human lives, which the Huguenots caused France to incur, the losses brought about by the revocation of the edict of Nantes do not deserve to be taken into account.

We must here brand the utterly unworthy partiality, the bad faith and hypocrisy of a certain class of writers who are always animated with bitter feelings against the Church. Undoubtedly the Governments of Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, following the examples of the reformers of the XVIth century, have, in our day, inflicted upon Catholics the harshest treatment. And yet, Catholics never claimed, as did the Calvinists, that they were a State within a State, imperium in imperio; they have never dreamt of defending their rights with weapons in their hands. On the contrary, they have given at all times, and they still give the example of the most complete submission to the ruling powers and the laws of the land, acting on the Christian principle that, though we may never be allowed by God's law *to do wrong*, yet we may, at times, be permitted or even obliged *to suffer wrong*. Why then persecute them? Why violently expel from their country thousands of priests and members of Religious Orders, male and female? Why? Solely because they are Roman Catholics! Do we see a single freethinker protesting against these outrages? No; they would rather reserve their maledictions and bitter invectives for Louis XIV and the Inquisition. The motive that inspires them can be a secret to no one.

CHAPTER X

THE AUTHORITY EXERCISED BY THE POPES DURING THE MIDDLE AGES OVER THE TEMPORAL POWER OF PRINCES

242. It is known that during the Middle Ages the Pope was universally considered as the supreme head of the immense Christian family scattered throughout the earth, and that he acted accordingly; he cited before his tribunal both sovereigns and subjects; settled differences arising among kings, and inflicted spiritual penalties upon scandalous and

incorrigible princes, and deprived of their dignities and rights those who obstinately persisted in disorder.

As this refers to the supreme Heads of the Catholic Church, it is evident that their action could not escape criticism on the part of the enemies of the Church. Let us see what should be thought of it.

I. The Power Exercised by the Popes During the Middle Ages over Christian Rulers Was Perfectly Legitimate

243. 1. This power was founded on the legislation or *public law of the times*, that is to say, on the political Constitutions which Christian nations, their general assemblies or their sovereigns had *themselves freely established.* The Pope was then regarded by princes and peoples as *the natural Head* and *common Father of Christendom.* There is, therefore, nothing astonishing in the fact that Christianity should have acknowledged his right to judge the claims of the contending parties, to recall the recalcitrant to duty, and to compel them to render justice by means of excommunication and deposition from power.

2. The greater part of the monarchies of the Middle Ages were, at the same time, *elective and hereditary;* it was notably so as to those of France, England and Spain. Generally a member of the reigning family was chosen to rule, but even the son or heir-presumptive, in order to succeed to his father, *had to be recognized by the general assembly of the nation.* It is easy to understand that these assemblies of the nation could impose *conditions* upon the princes they elected, who thereby became responsible to it. Now, as a matter of fact, one of the conditions generally imposed was *fidelity to the Catholic Faith,* and it was stipulated that if the prince deviated from it or persecuted it, he would, *ipso facto,* on that account *forfeit his power* to govern.

3. Besides, many princes had spontaneously offered their crown as a homage to the See of Peter, voluntarily submitting their kingdoms as fiefs of the Holy See and acknowledging themselves its vassals. Among these were John Lackland, King of England (1213), Robert Guiscard of Naples (about

1053), Roger II of Sicily (1130), Peter II of Aragon. St. Stephen, King of Hungary, had also, as early as the year 1000, offered his kingdom in homage to the Vicar of Christ, as Godfrey de Bouillon did that of Jerusalem. By virtue of these acts, the Pope had, as regards these States, the usual rights of a suzerain upon his vassals. But it is known that the feudal law conferred upon the suzerain the right to punish the felony of a vassal, who might fail in his obligations; he could reclaim his fief or confer the investiture upon another. The formulas of the oath taken by the vassals of the Holy See clearly attest this right of the Sovereign Pontiffs. Let us observe in passing that, as history testifies, no Pope has ever availed himself of this undeniable right, so as to appropriate to himself, in whole or in part, the States of a vassal guilty of felony.

244. Remarks. 1. To judge the Middle Ages by the ideas which have prevailed since the Protestant Reformation, and especially since the Peace of Westphalia, by which equal guarantees are attributed to the various Christian communions, would be a deplorable and foolish anachronism. "All Christians," says the learned Cardinal Hergenröther in his work "*L'Eglise catholique et l'Etat chrétien*" (The Catholic Church and the Christian State), "formed during the Middle Ages one single family. For this family a head was needed, a father, and it possessed such a head in him, whom all nations honored as the Common Father of Christendom, the Vicar of God, the successor of St. Peter, the representative of Jesus Christ, to whom was confided the power to feed the lambs and the sheep." "By entering into the Church," writes M. Moulart, professor at the University of Louvain, "by accepting Christianity as the State religion, by recognizing in the lofty end or purpose of religion the conquest of heaven as the sole and supreme goal, to which should be directed all societies of mankind; by putting, as a natural consequence of these premises, their laws in harmony with supernatural dogmas and morals, the nations of Europe reached a veritable union, based on an entire *conformity* of ideas, interests, tendencies and legislation, and they thus formed that world-wide spiritual society which we call Christendom." (Read in "*L'Histoire*

Générale de l'Eglise" (General History of the Church), by the Abbé Darras, vol. xxi, about the contest between St. Gregory VII and the German Emperor Henry IV.)

2. The ceremonies that took place at the coronation of the Emperor of the West clearly show the ideas of the times. The Pope warned the Emperor that he received power that he might govern his subjects, and *protect the true Church of God.* The Emperor answered by the following oath: "I, King of the Romans, by the grace of God, future Emperor, promise under oath, before God and St. Peter, to be henceforward the protector and defender of the Sovereign Pontiff and of the Holy Roman Church in all her necessities; I will keep and preserve intact all her possessions, and will revere and respect her rights as far as I shall be able, with the help of God, in good and sincere faith. So help me God and the Holy Gospels."

The tenor of the oath explains perfectly the language held by the great vassals of the Empire towards Henry IV at the time of his contest with St. Gregory VII or Hildebrand. They wrote to the Emperor "that they had sworn fidelity to him, but on condition that he should be king *for the edification and not for the destruction* of the Church of God; on condition that he would govern according to the laws of justice, respecting the possessions, the dignity and the rights of every one of his subjects." And they added that "since he had violated the solemn oath-bound compact, they on their part were freed from the oath of allegiance and fealty." These words of the great nobles make very clearly known the opinion held by contemporaries as to the Constitution of the empire.

245. As Father Schouppe pertinently remarks: "The Emperors of Germany were those who chiefly called forth severe measures from the Roman Pontiffs. They were in constant and serious disputes with the Holy See on account of the shameful traffic they carried on in regard to ecclesiastical dignities often conferred by them on unworthy subjects. The Popes had allowed them, in acknowledgment of the services they had rendered to the Church, the privilege of choosing and proposing subjects for bishopries in their dominions; but the

Emperors turned this privilege to the benefit of their own avarice and ambition, to the great prejudice of ecclesiastical discipline. St. Gregory VII, and his successors, who were zealous defenders of the rights of the Church, vigorously opposed these abuses. Moreover, in dealing with the Emperors of Germany, the Popes have been more authoritative than with other sovereigns, and this because these princes were exceptionally situated. In resuscitating the Empire of the West, the Papacy had established a *Christian Empire,* subject in temporal matters to an elective chief. The election, as stated above, was accompanied by a solemn promise to observe the rules of the Constitution, the neglect of which should deprive the elect of his rights. Among the articles of the Constitution was the solemn injunction on the chosen Ruler of maintaining and defending the Christian Religion of his subjects. Whenever the monarch failed to observe his sacred pledges, the Pope of necessity became his judge, and he alone was competent to decide as to his shortcomings; and thus it happened that in passing judgment on the chief of the nation, the Sovereign Pontiff simply carried out the provisions of the coronation oath by releasing the subjects from the oath of allegiance. The deposition, which followed, was but a legitimate consequence of the Germanic Constitution. Hence the political proceedings of the Papacy in the Middle Ages were founded on law, and were entirely in the interests of the princes and their subjects."

246. It might be asked if, as advanced by many authors, the power of the Popes in the Middle Ages *had not also another foundation* besides that indicated above, viz., if it was not also *by virtue of the divine right which belongs to them,* that the Sovereign Pontiffs have often intervened in matters of State. This is a question *subject to controversy,* and about which theologians differ, as the Church has pronounced no definite judgment on this matter. We cannot devote to this subject the examination that it deserves. Let us content ourselves with saying a few words only. According to the teachings of theology the Pope, who has received from God *direct* power as to *spiritual* things, as his own domain, has received

at the same time *indirect* power as to *temporal* things, that is to say, that power which is necessary for the Church *that she may fulfill her mission.* On this all are agreed. But when the question comes to determine in what this indirect power consists, we are far from finding any agreement. Undoubtedly all theologians recognize in the Pope a *directive* power; it is to him that belongs the right to interpret authoritatively both natural right and divine right; to enlighten and direct, by doctrinal decisions, the conscience of Christian princes and people, to judge the morality of their acts and to inflict upon the guilty ecclesiastical penalties. But can he do more? Can he, for instance, outside the special cases mentioned above, resort, of course for good reasons, to the deposition of princes, and free their subjects from their oath of allegiance? Opinions are divided, and the Church has given no decision. Bellarmine, for instance, maintains the affirmative. (De Rom. Pont. lib. 5, c. vii.) Others, as Bianchi and Gousset, hold that the Sovereign Pontiff does not himself depose the prince obstinately persisting in evil, but he confines himself to *declaring* that the abuse of power has been such that it entails by itself, *ipso facto,* the loss of power. There exists, say they, between a king and his subjects, a kind of oath of fidelity, at least implicit, and this oath is dissolved by the very fact that it becomes impossible for the subjects to preserve the Christian Faith unless the king be deprived of his throne; for, they add, the obligation *to preserve the Faith is of divine right,* whilst the obligation to obey this or that sovereign is of *human right,* which must yield to the former.

To prevent misconception we remark that *human right* by election or by the accepted law of heredity may place this or that prince on the throne; but when such an individual has been legitimately chosen by the votes of the nation, he rules and governs his subjects by *divine right* according to the principle laid down by the Apostle St. Paul. *"Let every soul be subject to higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation."* (Romans 13, 1, 2.)

247. Conclusion. Whatever may be thought of these controverted questions, one thing remains certain, it is that at the time when unity of Faith was complete, when there was a close alliance between Church and State, there existed *a real agreement or convention* by which the ruler bound himself to govern with justice, to defend the Faith, to prevent heresy and to guard himself from incurring excommunication. That was incontestably *the public law* of the period, and it is the *facts and circumstances of that epoch* that we have to take into account when discussing these questions. Did a ruler become unfaithful to his oath, it was natural that the head of Christianity should decide if he merited excommunication, and also determine if the time had come to declare his subjects *freed* from their oath of allegiance to the unfaithful trustee of power, who, by the very act of unfaithfulness, had lost his previous rights. In this way we easily explain the conduct of St. Gregory VII towards Henry IV; that of Innocent III toward John Lackland; of Innocent IV towards Frederic II; and of Boniface VIII towards Philip the Fair. This question has been handled in a masterly manner by the distinguished writer, the late Orestes Brownson, in several of his essays, where he demonstrates the following propositions:

248. "That the Popes have, in certain cases, deposed temporal sovereigns, and absolved their subjects from their allegiance is undoubtedly true: and that they have a right to do so in all analogous cases we suppose must be conceded. But the power has never been exercised over an infidel prince, or one who was not a spiritual subject of the Pope and bound by his profession, the tenure of his crown and the constitution and laws of his realm to protect and defend the Catholic religion.

(*a*) "Such was the case with Henry IV of Germany and with the Albigensian Counts of Toulouse in France. Such too was the case with Elizabeth of England. She was excommunicated by St. Pius V, deposed, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance. But she had personally professed the Catholic Religion, had succeeded to the crown as a Catholic, when the Catholic Constitution of England was still in force, and the Catholic Religion was a part and parcel of the law of

the land. She was bound by her profession, her coronation oath, the tenure of her crown and the laws of her realm, to be a Catholic, and to protect and defend the Catholic Religion. When she turned heretic, violated the Constitution of her kingdom, oppressed her subjects, abolished Catholicity, expelled the Catholic Bishops from their sees, set up a new hierarchy of her own creation, and persecuted, exiled, imprisoned, hung and beheaded the Catholics for adhering to their religion, she deserved excommunication for her heresy and wickedness, and deposition for her intolerable tyranny.

"It is evident from the analysis of all the cases of deposition that can be cited, that the Popes have always respected the constitution of the civil power, and that, when they interpose against the sovereign, it is always to vindicate the rights of the nation invaded by the prince. When a sovereign has made no war on the constitution and laws of his realm, when he has been faithful to his obligations and has preserved the tenor of his crown and ruled justly, the Pope has never claimed the power to depose him or absolve his subjects." (Brownson's Works, vol. X, pp. 349–350.)

(*b*) "With the testimony of history before us, we venture to assert that in no instance in the contests between the two powers have the secular authorities been in the right, and the Sovereign Pontiff in the wrong. The Sovereign Pontiffs have invariably used their power on the side of justice, and never have they deposed a prince who did not by his tyranny, his oppressions, his frightful iniquities, deserve to be deposed. They, whom they struck, were moral monsters, and the cause for which they struck was that of religion, virtue, innocence, and the liberties of their subjects, which they were trampling upon." (Brownson, vol. XI, p. 161.)

II. The Popes Have Made Use of Their Right in a Manner Most Salutary to Society

249. 1. History proves that during all the Middle Ages the Popes have rendered a priceless service to Christendom, by preventing rulers from being unfaithful to their duties and

by maintaining the people in rightful submission to their rulers.

In 1861, in his work "*L'Eglise et la Société*" (The Church and Society), Guizot wrote: "Taking everything into consideration, the Papacy, and the Papacy alone, knew how to be the mediating power, by defending, in the name of religion, the natural rights of man against the usurpations of the State, of the rulers, and even against the people itself. It was the Papacy that knew how to conciliate the weak with the powerful, by recommending everywhere and always justice, peace, respect for duty and assumed engagements; and it was in this way that the Papacy laid the corner stone of international law, by standing forth as a bulwark against the pretensions and passions of brutal force."

Among Protestant writers, Voigt in his history of Gregory VII, and Hurter in that of Innocent III, have proven that the Popes had saved civilization by the vigorous resistance which they opposed to the corruption of their times, and to the ambitious and despotic designs of Henry IV and Frederic II.

2. The Sovereign Pontiffs have often, by their decisions, put an end to quarrels among princes. In our day international congresses have largely taken the place of the Sovereign Pontiff. But this system is far from offering the same guarantees of impartiality and enlightenment that were given by the Father of Christendom. Hence it was unable to prevent the partition of Poland, the abolition of ecclesiastical principalities after the French Revolution, persecutions in Switzerland, Italy and other countries.

250. Remark. After an impartial study of the subject, the part played by the Papacy during the Middle Ages has become so highly thought of, that a distinguished Protestant writer, Mr. Urquhart, has not hesitated some time ago to suggest that, in international questions, nations should renounce the present system of congresses and return to the supreme arbitration of the Papacy. Already, at the end of the seventeenth century, Leibnitz had said: "According to my view, Europe and the civilized world should institute in Rome an arbitration tribunal, presided over by the Pope, entrusted with the duty

of inquiring into differences arising among Christian rulers. This tribunal erected over rulers, to direct and judge their quarrels, would bring us back to the golden age.'' The celebrated English Statesman Pitt also held this view, and in 1794 he wrote as follows: ''There should be found a new bond to unite us all together. The Pope alone could supply this bond. Rome alone would know how to make her impartial and unprejudiced voice heard; for no one doubts for a moment the impartiality and fairness of her judgment.'' And even Voltaire does not hesitate to assert: ''The interests of the human race demand a curb to restrain sovereigns and protect the life of the people; this curb might, by universal agreement, be placed in the hands of the Popes.''

CHAPTER XI

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES

251. The discussion concerning the power exercised during the Middle Ages by the Popes over the temporal rights of rulers leads us to say a few words about quite a different question, but one of great importance and of actual interest. We refer to the *temporal sovereignty* of the Roman Pontiffs.

''It was not without a particular disposition of the Providence of God that this authority (the Church) should have been provided with a civil principality as the surest guarantee of her independence.'' (Encl. ''Immortale Dei'' of Leo XIII.) As St. Anselm says: ''God loves nothing more than the liberty of His Church.''

History proves the *perfect legitimacy* of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. It was so well prepared and brought about by events that, according to the words of J. de Maistre, ''the Popes became sovereigns without noticing it, and in spite of themselves.'' Already in the fourth, and especially in the fifth century, the Church of Rome possessed extensive territories in many countries of Europe and Africa; and it is owing, in part, to this pacific royalty that St. Gregory the Great was enabled to perform the wonderful marvels of his

pontificate. In law, the sovereignty of the emperors still existed, but in fact the paternal rule of the Roman Pontiffs had replaced their domination. The invasion of the Barbarians and the utter abandonment in which the Emperors of Byzantium had left unfortunate Italy, compelled the people to seek safety and protection under the Papacy, which on several occasions had saved them from imminent peril, and which everywhere caused order and justice to reign around them. The temporal supremacy of the Popes, tacitly acknowledged by the Emperors of Constantinople, was singularly strengthened by the solemn act of Pepin the Short, in which he bound himself "to cause to be restored to the Holy See all the towns and territories usurped, and consequently wrongfully occupied by the Lombards." Not only was this promise fulfilled, but new territorial gifts were added by him to the restored provinces, and this liberal donation was sanctioned in 754 by an act of perpetual cession on behalf of the Holy See, signed by the King of the Lombards. Then came the rich gifts of Charlemagne, and later those of the Countess Mathilda of Canossa. The great Emperor, who only confirmed the pontifical sovereignty already existing for a long time, promised, as also did the French nobles, "to preserve to the Holy See the States that had been solemnly restored to it."

De Maistre was therefore right in saying that "there is nothing so evidently just in its origin as the pontifical sovereignty." "The temporal dominion of the Holy See," says the Protestant Gibbon, "is founded on a thousand years of respect, and the best title of the Popes to sovereignty is the free choice of a people delivered by them from servitude." Hence the logical conclusion: "If the possessions of the Head of the Church are put in doubt, all the sovereign families that reign to-day should prepare to descend from their thrones."

252. This is not the place to refute the silly objections by which the attempt is made to establish absolute incompatibility between the spiritual power of the Popes and their temporal sovereignty. Gregory the Great was none the less a most beneficent Pontiff because he was also a prince; the exercise of temporal power did not make his life less holy, the

Papacy less venerable, and the conquests of the Faith less rapid and less glorious. We see by the history of the Papacy itself, that *territorial independence* is, in the designs of Providence, truly a *guarantee* of spiritual independence, necessary for the Head of the Universal Church. "For the Pope," said Thiers in a celebrated speech, "there can be no *spiritual* independence without *temporal* independence, without sovereignty." Napoleon I himself had seen how important it was for the Sovereign Pontiff to be, as Bossuet says, "in a position to exercise more freely, for the common good, and under the common protection of Christian kings, his heavenly power to rule souls." These are the words of Napoleon, as reported by Thiers, the author of "*Le Consulat et l'Empire*," (History of the Consulate and the Empire): "The Pope is not at Paris; it is well; he is neither at Madrid nor at Vienna, and this is why we reverence his spiritual authority. At Vienna and Madrid they feel the same with regard to Paris. Do you believe that if he were at Paris the Austrians and the Spaniards would consent to accept his decisions? We are therefore only too happy that he resides elsewhere than with us, and that, residing elsewhere, he does not reside with our rivals. Let him inhabit in Rome, his ancient seat, far from the grasp of the Emperors of Germany, far from that of France and of the Kings of Spain, holding an equal balance between the Catholic sovereigns, always somewhat inclined towards the most powerful, and arousing himself promptly to the exercise of his authority whenever the most powerful should become oppressors. It is the centuries that have done this, and they have done well. For the governing of souls, it is the best and the most beneficent institution that can be imagined. I do not entertain these views through the impulse of religious devotion, but from motives of reason." (Book XII.)

253. We could add other proofs in favor of the Pontifical royalty, and particularly its happy results for the good administration of the interior affairs of the Church; but contemporary events have undertaken to place under a bright light the advantages of this providential institution. Moreover, the unanimity with which the enemies of the Church have ap-

plauded the sacrilegious usurpations, to which we have been the sorrowing witnesses, their bitter opposition to the restoration of the pontifical sovereignty, all these facts show forth to every faithful member of the Church the legitimacy and the expediency of the claims of the Holy See and of the Catholic world. It is in order that the spiritual supremacy of the Popes may be exercised freely and efficiently, that true Catholics will not cease to demand the re-establishment of the temporal sovereignty of the Apostolic See.

254. Before concluding this subject, we must call the reader's attention to a popular objection, very ably solved by Fr. Schouppe in his "Abridged Course of Religious Instruction" (pp. 90–92), which is as follows:

" 'The Papal authority, it is urged, is entirely spiritual.' Without doubt it is spiritual and divine; but, though spiritual, it does not exclude temporal means. The ecclesiastical, like the civil power, being intended for the government of men, must possess also an analogous exterior organization and means of action. The words of Jesus Christ, '*My kingdom is not of this world,*' were a reply to Pilate, who asked our Lord if He was, as the Jews said, a king; and He answered that He was truly a king, but that His title need not alarm the Roman Government, because His kingdom was not like that of the princes of this world. He meant that He had not come to re-establish amongst the Jews the ancient throne of David, nor to form a kingdom prejudicial to the Romans, who were then the actual masters of Judea; but that the kingdom He had come to establish was His Church, which He had called the Kingdom of Heaven; a real kingdom, though unlike those purely terrestrial, as its tendency, its principal means, and its final term were purely celestial."

Such is the ordinary interpretation of these words. They do not imply, as our adversaries would have it, that the Church is an *entirely spiritual* kingdom, and that all temporal possessions must be foreign to her; but that the princes of this world have nothing to fear from the Church, whose aim is heaven and not earthly conquests, though the *use of earthly means* is not denied her. Moreover, our Lord does not, as the learned

Tolet remarks, say that His kingdom is not *in this world*, but that it is not *of this world*, because it in fact *does exist in this world* amongst mankind, and this necessitates the employment of such earthly means as circumstances may require. The temporal dominion of the Pope is one of these means; and according to the best authenticated interpreters, such as St. Chrysostom (*Panegyric of St. Babylas*) and St. Augustine (*Tract 15, in Joan.*), our Savior, far from declaring that temporal power was not His, only speaks here of the *origin* of His regal power, which He declares He holds, not from this world, but from His Father who is in heaven. The Pope may therefore be at once Head of the Church and sovereign of a temporal State, such as he has been ever since the eighth century, owing to the donations of Pepin, Charlemagne, Lothair, and later on, the Countess Mathilda. This temporal sovereignty does not emanate from the spiritual sovereignty, to which it is not absolutely necessary, seeing that during the first ages of the Church it did not exist; but from the eighth century it was the means chosen by Divine Providence to maintain the spiritual authority of the chief of Catholicity in liberty and independence. And in our days, as well as at any previous time, the integrity of the States of the Church, and the temporal independence of the Popes, are *morally necessary* conditions of the free exercise of their spiritual authority; in other words, the possession of a temporal domain is necessary, not to the existence, but to the well-being of the Church—*"Requiritur potestas temporalis pro Ecclesia Dei non ut sit, sed potius ut bene sit."*

The Temporal Power of the Popes has fallen; it has been suppressed and abolished in Italy with the tacit approval and connivance of the European monarchies and republics, where diplomacy, without shedding a drop of the blood of their subjects, could have prevented the sacrilegious usurpation of the most just, legitimate and sacred possession existing in the world, the patrimony of St. Peter and his successors. The ten years that preceded the perpetration of that international crime, through the Sardinian troops in 1870, were marked by a series of political and diplomatic frauds unequalled in his-

tory. In the years past, when one or more of the European powers were in conflict with the Holy See, some of the others were friendly and gave it protection. In the present crisis not one stood in its defense. They all, with one accord, hid their faces from the Vicar of our Lord. The public law of Europe had undergone a visible change, the moral perversion that sanctioned the usurpation of the rightful, helpless princedom of the Roman pontiffs. The annals of history relating the experience of the past inform us that no nation or ruler, that laid hand on the Vicar of Christ, has ever prospered, has ever escaped the rod. The duplicity and countenance of Napoleon III in the Roman Question, abetted by the apathy of the French nation, are well known. France was then in her place of pride in the world; her military power was believed to be unconquerable. But there were those who foretold its downfall. The result of the Franco-German war in 1870 proved that their apprehensions were correct. That the recent European war with its untold calamities and disasters both to the victors and to the conquered, was, in the designs of God's justice, a well merited chastisement, few, if any Christian believers will venture to deny.

Whilst humbly adoring the inscrutable designs of Divine Providence, the question may be asked: Shall the wrong done to the Roman Pontiffs, the Vicars of Christ, ever be righted? Shall the Pope, the spiritual Father of Christendom, rule again in Rome as a free, independent, temporal King? The late Cardinal Manning in his work "The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ" gives us the answer.

"We may see in history that it was the personal sovereignty of the Pontiffs which held together and maintained the local princedom committed to them. First of all they purchased it by a line of martyrdoms. It is the law of warfare that the army, which remains upon the field, is victor. If the assailant cannot drive it from its entrenchments, it remains the conqueror. Some thirty Pontiffs fell upon the field. By their blood they purchased the city of Rome, and held it as their own. It belongs to them by right of endurance and of inflexible courage, to which the world has no equal. Now from

this I draw two evident conclusions. First that sufferings, anxieties, conflicts within and without have always been and always will be the normal condition of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. In fact there has hardly been a century, in which the States of the Church have not been occupied, dismembered and usurped by crowned rulers. Nine Pontiffs have been driven out of Rome by the Roman factions. Yet it has been held with such invincible tenacity, and such perpetual power of recovery as to establish a moral certainty that God, who chose it for the throne of the Vicar of His Son, has done so by a definite act of His power, which He alone can rescind, and which He never will. The other conclusion is this: In the history of the Holy See we observe likewise that as it is the law, so to speak, of the temporal sovereignty committed to Christ's Vicar that it should be perpetually assailed, so there is another law equally certain, founded on the same basis, that it is also his normal condition to be always restored. All those forms of rebellion, revolution and usurpation have but a momentary success. Then the Almighty with a divine scorn and a majestic indignation smites the culprits and sweeps them from the face of the earth. Indeed all conflicts, which Divine Providence permits against the Church and its Head, the Vicar of Christ, are ultimately intended for the furtherance of the Faith, and for the greater triumph of the Holy See. Through them the Christian world will become more Catholic and Rome more than ever united to its Pontiffs." (The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ—Part III, lecture I.)

CHAPTER XII

THE BAD POPES

255. It is against the sanctity of the Church (n. 41) that the following accusation is made: The Church has not always been a school of morality, because even some of her Heads have dishonored the Pontifical See.

After what has been previously said, the answer presents no difficulty.

I. Can there be bad Popes?

Yes, undoubtedly there may be bad Popes. The Church labors unceasingly to sanctify her members; that is her mission. But grace, offered to man to enlighten his intelligence and strengthen his will, does not constrain him. He may refuse this grace and act contrary to his belief. He can do so only by stifling the cry of conscience and by trampling under foot a religion which never ceases to recall him to his duty, exhort him to virtue, and threaten him with the most terrible chastisement if he persists in his evil way. The Church therefore contains always sinners in her midst; always, side by side with the greatest virtues, there have been disorders and vices, the effects of the weakness of the human heart. Here we are reminded of our Savior's parable of the wheat and the cockle growing together: "*Let both grow until the harvest, and in time of the harvest I will say to the reapers: Gather up first the cockle, and bind it into bundles to burn, but gather the wheat into my barn.*" (Matt. 13, 30.) Here the distinction must be observed which exists between the authority itself, and the person who holds it, between the Pontifical office and the Pontiff that exercises it. The latter is susceptible of corruption, but not the former. Just as the authority of parents and monarchs is ever worthy of respect, though there have been numbers of bad parents and bad kings, so the divinely instituted power of the Popes has not become less holy because it may have sometimes passed into the hands of unworthy representatives.

The Popes themselves, in spite of their eminent dignity and the onerous obligations flowing therefrom, do not cease to be men; if they are infallible in doctrinal teaching (n. 117), they are not impeccable or *incapable of sin.* They may, therefore, fall, as St. Peter himself fell, but their sin is the act of *the man* and not of *the Pontiff;* these stains, altogether personal, do not contaminate the sanctity nor the authority of the *Apostolic See.* It is on such occasions that it is well to repeat the words of our Lord, "*Whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works, do ye not: for they say and do not.*" Matt. 23, 3.)

256. In this connection let us add the following judicious remarks of Dr. Brownson (vol. X, pp. 252–253), which contain, in my opinion, a very satisfactory reply to the difficulty of our dissenting brethren, who are wont to allege, as a reason for not entering our Church, the sinful conduct of some Catholics, of the clergy or the laity, whose actions are in direct contradiction with the requirements of their belief: "There is an inexcusable want of science, as well as gross injustice, in holding the Church responsible for the conduct of those members of her external communion, whoever they be, who disobey her instructions, and will not comport themselves as her faithful and dutiful children. The glory of the Church is not tarnished by human depravity, even though it may be found in persons holding the highest dignities. It is not fair to ascribe to the Church that which she has never produced, and which is repugnant to her. Our modern travelers, who have so much to say of the ignorance and corruption they meet, or pretend they meet with in Catholic countries, would do well to bear this in mind. The individuals they hold up as exhibiting the fruits of Catholicity, are precisely those who do not exhibit them—are precisely those who neglect the teaching and break the precepts of the Church. The practical effect of any religion must be judged of from the uniform character of those who sincerely and faithfully practice it, not from the character of those who do not. Whoever would look for the fruits of Catholicity must look for them in her obedient children, who believe what she teaches, and do what she commands. The moral and religious worth of these no sane man can really question." In other words, the practice of Catholic Faith makes the perfect Christian and the Saint; its neglect swells the number of the reprobate. In one case we have the result of the rightful use of human liberty, cooperating with God's grace; in the other we see the dire effect of its abuse and the rejection of heavenly help.

II. In reality, have there been many bad Popes?

257. 1. History enumerates from St. Peter to Pius XI 261 Popes, who, with very few exceptions, have been irreproach-

able, and of whom a great number have been men eminent by their science, wisdom and virtues. The number comprises sixty Saints, mostly martyrs. Is not this a spectacle as worthy of admiration as it is of respect? Where shall we find, in the civil order, a dynasty comparable to this series of rulers of the Holy Roman Catholic Church?

2. History mentions, it is true, some Popes who seem to form an exception, especially Stephen VI and John XII in the tenth century, Benedict IX in the eleventh century, and Alexander VI at the close of the fifteenth. In the first place the number is small indeed; it disappears in the multitude of the others. Would it be just to be always inveighing against the *magistracy,* because some of its members had proven themselves false to their duty, or against the *art of printing* because there are writers who make bad use of this invention?

258. 3. Moreover, it is proved that many facts alleged against the Popes have been either invented by malice, exaggerated, or represented under false colors. For instance, the absurd story of the female Pope Joan, who, according to the legend, occupied the chair of Peter, under the name of John VIII, after the death of Leo IV in 855. This fable, which was current for a long time, is admitted to be an historical falsehood by Protestants themselves and by unbelievers, such as Dumoulin, Bayle and Basnage. Reinkens, when professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of Breslau, said: "Do you know who yet believe this barefaced imposture, fabricated by the enemies of the Papacy? Only journals tainted with liberalism and Protestant school boys in the fourth reader." There is more than one Pope, whose memory unjustly traduced by writers hostile to the Church, has been completely vindicated, and, what is very remarkable, by Protestant historians. This is the case, for instance, as to Gregory VII, by Voigt, and Innocent III, by Hurter.

4. It must also be observed that the few accused Popes belonged chiefly to an age when the secular power interfered with the liberty of Papal election, and sought to thrust unworthy candidates on the Pontifical throne.

5. Another circumstance worthy of remark is this: No

Pope, no matter what may have been his private conduct, ever promulgated a decree against the purity of Faith and morals; not one of them ever taught anything or did anything *for the purpose of legalizing or justifying his disorders.* Assuredly the same thing cannot be said of the founders of Protestantism (nn. 55–58). These gentlemen decided that nothing was more urgent than the abolition of celibacy for the clergy, and of monastic vows for religious. We can see in this fact of the irreproachable official conduct of the Popes a striking proof of the assistance which God never ceases to give to His Church.

259. As a fitting conclusion to this article we cite the following appropriate remarks of Dr. O. Brownson, vol. X, p. 383: "We do not pretend that the Popes are personally impeccable, nor that every Pope has been a saint; but we have yet to see full evidence that any one of them, during his Pontificate, has been a very bad man. Nearly all we read against some few of them is mere calumny, invented by men whose projects they had thwarted, or by political or sectarian spite and vindictiveness. We are slow to believe anything against a single Pope, and we have little doubt that even Alexander VI, after he became Pope, could be found, if the truth were known, to be, even as a man, worthy of our respect. When we find a Pope painted in very black colors, we always take it for granted that there were very wicked men in his reign, whose schemes and wickedness he defeated, and whose pride and ambition he offended. The Sovereign Pontiff is, under God, the fountain of all the authority we respect on earth, and we have no praise for those who offer him insults, or withhold from him the loyalty of their hearts. The saddest page of all modern history is that which records the ingratitude of individuals and nations to the holy Pontiffs, who for these nineteen hundred years have ruled the Church of God, and labored for the eternal welfare of mankind. They have borne the brunt of the battle; they have been the mark of every arrow; they have been the peculiar objects of the wrath of men and the assaults of hell. They have often been insulted by their own children; and scarcely one drop of consolation have they, during those long ages, been permitted to taste,

except that consolation which is vouchsafed them by the interior visits of the Holy Spirit. O, how the world has wronged them, and how slow and how loath are we ourselves to make them some reparation! O, let our hearts gush forth in warm and pure love to the Vicegerent of God on earth, and never for a moment suffer a mere secular prince to weigh in the balance with him!"

CHAPTER XIII

OTHER CHARGES AND OBJECTIONS FROM NON-CATHOLICS

260. Under this general heading we here intend to group several other difficulties commonly raised against the Catholic Church. They are the following:

1. Devotion to the Mother of God, the Saints and Angels, and their invocation.
2. The Catholic Doctrine on Indulgences.
3. The dogma of Purgatory and the suffrages for the benefit of the departed, who died in Christ.
4. The use of Sacred Images, Medals, Beads, Holy Water and blessed Ashes.
5. The veneration of the Relics of the Saints.
6. The use of the Latin language, particularly in the sacred service.
7. Holy Communion given to the Faithful only under one kind.
8. The doctrine of Transubstantiation.
9. Sacramental Confession or the Tribunal of Penance.
10. The Ceremonies and Ritual of the Church.
11. The transmission of the sin of Adam to his posterity, very ably treated by the late Father Richard Clarke, S.J., in "*The Month*" for 1885.

261. In the first place, as most of the aforementioned subjects contain articles of Faith solemnly defined by the Church, a general answer to all the difficulties raised by non-Catholics against them is found in our article on the Infallibility of the

Church, in which that divine privilege or prerogative has been demonstrated by arguments that admit of no reply. (nn. 108–121.)

To give the reader some idea of the overwhelming testimony—*nubes testium*—that Catholic writers can allege from the unbroken tradition of the past nineteen centuries in confirmation of the dogmas defined by the Church, let me briefly refer to the one mentioned above (n. 8) viz., Transubstantiation, as an instance in point. By this term is meant the miraculous, astounding change of the elements of bread and wine into the sacred Body and precious Blood of Jesus Christ by the words of consecration in holy Mass, a prodigy effected by divine omnipotence through the ministry of validly ordained priests. This is the article of Faith, which a German Benedictine monk, Conrad Boppert, undertook to demonstrate in a most valuable work, that cost him eighteen long years of indefatigable labor. The result was truly marvelous. His researches in the monuments of antiquity, from the dawn of the Christian era up to his time (A.D. 1811), enabled him to bring as witnesses to the truth of Christ's real presence in the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist the following array of authorities, viz.: 18 General and 62 Particular Councils, 8 Ancient Liturgies, and upward of 4300 quotations from 300 writers, representing the Christian learning of the past in every part of the Christian world!

A similar line of arguments might be followed in proving any other dogma believed and defined by the Catholic Church. Indeed, we may here exclaim with the royal prophet, "*Thy testimonies, O Lord, have become exceedingly credible.*" (Ps. 92, 5.) Is there in the wide world any historical fact, any belief or creed resting on such testimonies as these? And is it not the height of presumption, stupidity and pride to refuse to accept the authority of such witnesses as those alleged on behalf of that dogma? Now among the witnesses to the truth of the real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist we reckon Saints, holy Martyrs, who shed their blood for the Faith, Popes, Bishops, Priests, theologians, the brightest intellects that ever lived, and the many millions of the Faithful

that lived and died in the Catholic Church during the last nineteen centuries. Were they all deceived? Were they all idolaters? And did they all conspire to deceive their hearers and their readers? And did the divine Redeemer permit such a monstrous, huge deception in His Church during the last nineteen hundred years, in spite of His solemn promise, that the gates of hell, therefore of error, shall not prevail against her? And must we then be compelled to believe that God, infinite holiness and immutable truth, inspired the Reformers, called by Littledale *unmitigated scoundrels*, and authorized them to reveal to the Christian world that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a downright superstition, that the worship of Christ in the Eucharist is damned idolatry and that henceforth we should reject the doctrines of the Catholic Church and accept the contradictory teachings of Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Beza, Melanchthon, Queen Elizabeth and Edward VI, the boy king of England? But enough on this subject. The work referred to in our argument is the following: "Scutum fidei ad usus quotidianos Sacerdotum," by Dom Conrad Boppert, O.S.B. (Rome, 1898, 12 vols.).

Secondly, as to devotional practices, or disciplinary measures, which do not necessarily involve any dogmatic definition, they are doubtless worthy of all respect, when we consider their venerable antiquity, often traced to the times of the Apostles, and the manifold spiritual benefits they invariably produce.

262. Moreover, it is a well-known fact that all the objections ever raised by unbelievers and other non-Catholics against the dogmas and practices of the Roman Catholic Church have been triumphantly answered by Catholic writers, as proved by the numberless controversial works published throughout Christendom, and accessible to all who care to read them. To adduce an example out of many, the controversial literature in the English language of the last two centuries has enriched our libraries with masterpieces, that will bear comparison with the productions of any other civilized country.

Authors Consulted in Part VIII

Bainvel, Rev. J., S.J., "Is There Salvation outside the Catholic Church?" (Herder, St. Louis).

Baumgarten, P. M., "H. C. Lea's Historical Writings. The Spanish Inquisition" (Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York).

Brownson, Orestes, Works, vols. V, p. 522; X, pp. 349, 381; XII, "The Papal Power" (Thorndike Nourse, Detroit).

Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. IV, article "Crusades"; vol. XIV, article "Toleration" (The Encyclopedia Press, New York).

Cobbett, William, "History of the Reformation," Letter X (Murphy, Baltimore).

Coler, Bird S., "Two and Two Make Four," chs. 3 and 8 (F. D. Beattys and Co., New York).

D'Alès, Rev. A., "Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique," tome II, pp. 149–192. Article by Pierre De Vregille (Beauchesne, Paris).

De Maistre, Count Joseph, "Letters on the Spanish Inquisition" (Donohoe, Boston).

Dublanchy, Rev. E., S.M., "De Axiomate: Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," No Salvation Outside the Church (Benziger Bros., New York). A very able dissertation that won for the author the degree of Doctor of Theology from the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. (1895).

Dublin Review, The, April, May, June, 1924, "The Problem of St. Bartholomew's Massacre," by Maurice Wilkinson, M.A. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London).

Duchesne, Mgr. L., D.D., "The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, A.D. 754–1073" (Kegan Paul, Trench, London).

Epinois, Henri, "Procès de Galileo," The Galileo Trial (Palmé, Paris).

Fahie, J. J., "Galileo, His Life and Work" (Murray, London).

Fredet, Rev. Dr. Peter, "Modern History," Revised Edition. "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes," p. 488 (Murphy, Baltimore).

Gebler, Karl, "Galileo and the Roman Curia" (Kegan Paul, Trench, London).

Grisar, Rev. Hartmann, S.J., "A Study of Galileo" (Pustet, Ratisbon).

Guggenberger, Rev. A., "A General History of the Christian Era," vol. I, book III, ch. 1–3. (Herder, St. Louis).

Kenrick, Most Rev. Archbishop, "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated," Part II, "Secular Relations" (Murphy, Baltimore).

Hull, Rev. E. R., S.J., "Galileo and His Condemnation" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Loughnan, Rev. W., S.J., "St. Bartholomew's Day—The Huguenots" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Manning, Cardinal Edward, "The Independence of the Holy See: The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ" (Burns and Oates, London).

Müller, Rev. Michael, C.SS.R., "Out of the Church There Is Positively No Salvation. Catholic Dogma Defined in the IV Lateran Council (1215)" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Murphy, Count John Nicholas, "The Chair of Peter," ch. 39. "Alleged Unworthy Popes" (Burns and Oates, London).

Murray, Rev. Patrick, "De Ecclesia Christi. Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus," vol. 3, p. 731. A most satisfactory and theological discussion (Gill, Dublin).

O'Reilly, Rev. Edmund, S.J., "The Relations of the Church to Society," pp. 223, 327, 392 (J. Hodges, London).

Parsons, Rev. Reuben, D.D., "Studies in Church History," 6 vols., vol. II, chs. 11, 18, 31; vol. III, chs. 22, 23; vol. IV, ch. 11 (Pustet, New York).

Quatrefages, A. de, "The Human Species" (Appleton, New York).

Sydney, Rev. F., S.J., "The Spanish Inquisition" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Schouppe, Rev. F. X., S.J., "A Course of Religious Instruction," p. 92 (Burns and Oates, London).

Wegg-Prosser, "Galileo and His Judges" (Chapman and Hall, London).

PART IX

SOME RECENT MENTAL ABERRATIONS EXPOSED AND REFUTED

CHAPTER I

AGNOSTICISM

264. Of all modern "isms," Agnosticism has least claim to originality, and, though bearing a Greek name, is the most unscholarly form of unbelief that has yet appeared. Pantheism, atheism, and all heresies, philosophical and religious, to be understood and adopted, require some learning; but to be an Agnostic one needs only "not to know." Hence it is not original, since ignorance is one of the oldest things in the world; and it is most unscholarly, because the more ignorant one is, the more agnostic he becomes.

The Agnostic rejects the supernatural as "unknowable." He does not say with the atheist, "there is no God," but he says, "there may be, but I do not know that there is." He does not deny the existence of the soul and future life, but says that they are outside the sphere of experience, and, therefore, "unknowable."

That we do not know God, the soul, and future life, visibly and tangibly, as we know the material world, is true; but does that fact prevent our knowing of their existence? There are things in the world of which we know nothing more than that they exist, *e.g.*, chemical affinity, magnetic force, gravity, electricity, etc. To know only the fact of God's existence is all-sufficient to prove supernaturalism; and of that fact we have knowledge with certainty. It is not the alternative of

knowing or not knowing the supernatural that perplexes the Agnostic; it is his inability to know them by "experience." Because he cannot know supernatural truths by the evidence of his senses, he denies that they can be known at all. The absurdity of such an assertion is self-evident.

To know is an act of the intellect and not of the senses. Knowledge is the intellectual possession of the truth of things. The intellect is the supreme faculty of mind, which alone of all our faculties is capable of knowing or recognizing truth. In searching for truth the intellect uses, as instruments, the senses, reason and testimony. These are to the intellect what the telescope and mathematical instruments are to the astronomer. The Agnostic sets too much value upon sensible experience, and ignores reason and testimony. The surgeon who "found not the soul in using his lancet" was a good Agnostic; but, if his surgery was no better than his reasoning, he was only a quack. The senses report to the intellect only the presence and qualities of material objects. Reason abstracts their truths, and disentangles truth from error. The intellect does not accept the evidence of the senses until it has tested it by the analysis of reason.

265. Moreover, abstract truths, such as wisdom, justice, honesty, heroism, cannot be apprehended at all by the senses. Does the Agnostic say that, therefore, they are not "knowable"? On the contrary, logical deductions from sure and certain premises, give us knowledge with certitude. The demonstrations of the exact sciences, though unrecognizable by the senses, give to the intellect certitude so irresistible, that even a willing doubter cannot deny it. Hence "knowable" truths are not those of sensible experience only, but are all truths apprehensible by the intellect, whether through the senses or through the operations of reason. It is always and only the intellect that knows, no matter what instrument it uses—senses, or reason, or testimony.

But supernatural truths are apprehensible by the intellect, and are, therefore, "knowable." Though we cannot see God with our bodily eyes, the intellect sees in nature uncontradictory proofs of His existence and of His intelligence.

Nature proves the existence and intelligence of the mind that planned it. The old argument from design can never be ignored nor refuted. The human intellect, seeing design—the work of mind—in the Universe, recognizes the existence of its intelligent Designer. Is it rational, even to suppose it possible, that any blind, mindless force has constructed this well-planned Universe? Can any sane mind believe that animal organisms are the haphazard production of some mindless cause? The Agnostic believes only what is vouched for by his "experience"; has his experience ever known anything that was organized without a thinking organizer? Truly it is infinitely easier and wiser to be a believer in God than it is to be an unbelieving Agnostic.

The existence of God is, of course, the foundation truth of supernaturalism. That admitted, the other truths of supernatural religion are easily "knowable" to a healthy mind. The searchlight of intellect reveals God not only in nature, but in the history of the Jews, vouched for by their presence to this day, by their Sacred Scriptures, by their ancient cities and tombs, by pagan historians, and by archeological discoveries.

266. There are several wrong principles upon which Agnosticism is based. The following is the chief one. Their advocates tell us "that nothing can be reasonably demonstrated but what is known through the senses by observation and experiment; that the invisible and the supernatural are not the domain of rational beings; that therefore the only true knowledge we are able to acquire is that of the material Universe placed within the reach of our sensitive faculties."

First of all, it is plain that here the disciples forget the doings of their leader, the Coriphæus of Agnosticism, the late Herbert Spencer, who, while declaring the Supreme Being wholly unknowable, by using not his senses, observation or experiment, but his intellect, asserts, inconsistently with his system, same unknowable Being to be existent, supreme, the Ultimate Reality, the Infinite, the Absolute, the Unconditioned.

Moreover, because we find much by means of our sensitive

faculties, observation and experience, is it therefore proved that we can find out nothing by any other means? Sir Isaac Newton certainly knew something about science; yet does he not declare in his "Principia" that to treat of God and infer His existence and principal attributes is a necessary part of natural philosophy?

Besides, Agnostics take for granted that no evidence is of any value which is not intrinsic and capable of experimental demonstration, an assertion absolutely false, and consequently rejected by all who understand anything about that part of logic which treats of the several criterions of truth.

We may reach truth by two perfectly distinct methods, namely by experimental investigation, when the matter in question is capable of it; or by the testimony of external authority, for truth must, in every case, come to us in a manner conformable to its nature. The spiritual and the material worlds are essentially distinct; therefore the method suitable to things material will be found quite unsuitable to things spiritual. The principle of authority, admitted by all sound philosophers and continually acted upon by all mankind, is a perfectly reliable criterion of truth. To exclude all the truths which we are unable to verify by experiment or by ocular demonstration, such as history, biography, geography, literature, the many data and results of scientific studies handed down to posterity by predecessors, would rob us of ninety-nine hundredths of all the knowledge we can possess.

The physical, metaphysical and moral arguments developed in the First Part of this Course, whilst furnishing an irrefutable demonstration of the existence of God, constitute, at the same time, the refutation of atheism as well as of Agnosticism.

But there are two ways of knowing God. One consists in mental research and the logical process of reasoning, the one referred to above. It is called the philosophical knowledge of God, a somewhat laborious proceeding, requiring time, leisure and a certain degree of mental training not within the reach of all men. The other kind of divine knowledge springs up spontaneously in every man at the very sight of the wonder-

ful world that confronts him. Catholic philosophers and theologians designate this second kind of knowledge of God as God's witness of Himself, that is of His existence, to every rational creature (John 1, 9), an endowment, so to speak, of nature, inherent in every man without preliminary instruction; a knowledge that rises of itself and grows in clearness in proportion as reason is developed, enabling every reasonable being to know its author with certainty and facility. Now it is precisely of this knowledge, accessible to the light of reason, that both the Old and the New Testament of Holy Scripture speak. In the book of Wisdom (13, 1, 5) we read: *"All men are vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God. By the good things that are seen, the creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby."* Here the Sacred Writer calls this knowledge a *sight, may be seen,* to express the clearness and certitude which can be obtained. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (1, 19–20) referring to the ungodliness and injustice of the heathens, the wilful impediment to the knowledge of the only true God, says that they are inexcusable, for *"that which is known of God is manifested in them. For God hath manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also and divinity."* Hence no one need be surprised at the fact of the general consent of mankind in admitting the existence of a Supreme Being, the Creator and Maker of the Universe (n. 8, Vol. I, 15–23).

Bearing in mind the preceding considerations, we hold that, generally speaking, no speculative or practical Agnosticism is possible without an antecedent rebellion against the Supreme Ruler, whose existence was formerly acknowledged, but whose moral precepts were found irksome and unbearable, a reflection that reminds us of the paramount influence of the moral conduct on religious belief. What the royal Psalmist says of the atheist can with truth be applied to the Agnostic, who is an atheist in disguise. *"The fool hath said in his heart there is no God,"* and the same inspired writer tells us at once that the denial of the Creator's existence is

not the fruit of intellectual conviction but the result of moral corruption. "*They are corrupted and become abominable in iniquities.*" (Psalm 52, 1, 2.) As Hettinger writes (Natural Religion, p. 76), "The degradation of man to a state of brutishness and imbecility is the characteristic effect of atheism, whether found among isolated savage tribes, or in individuals of a civilized race." (See *The Month,* vols. 45, 46, 77.)

As Father Woodlock wisely remarks: "There are few who openly and blatantly deny the existence of God. Alas! There are many who live without any thought of Him, who live as though there were no God, though they do not affirm, even in the secrecy of their hearts 'there is no God.' They are practical if not theoretical atheists (n. 38 vol. I). But if there be few who deny God's existence, the number of Agnostics—of men who declare the human mind incapable of solving the question of His existence—is increasing with terrible rapidity. This Agnosticism is due intellectually either to a false psychology, which unseats reason in the name of rationalism, and limits man's mental processes to sense perception, or to a false supposition that God, if He exists, is so utterly incomprehensible that even the fact of His existence is beyond man's certain knowledge. But we must not admit that the human mind is so incapable. It is the obvious function of reason to deduce from visible effects invisible causes adequate to the production of these effects. Though God's nature cannot be perfectly comprehended by a finite mind, many truths concerning God can be reached by human reason working on the data of science and experience." (Catholicism and True Rationalism, ch. 1.)

CHAPTER II

FREE THOUGHT

267. We meet at times with systems, theories and opinions so glaringly wrong that their confutation is found in their very definition. The topic of the present chapter furnishes an example in point. In fact our newest and best dictionaries thus define it: "That thought is called free which is unrestrained, untrammelled by any of the established rules, and is opposed to generally recognized authority. Hence a Freethinker is one who refuses to submit his reason to the control of authority, particularly in matters of morals and religious belief." Therefore liberty of thought, in the mind of those that profess it, must mean the right to form ideas and judgments of things as they please without let or hindrance from any one.

In the first place, let us inquire if it is true that our sublimest endowment, our intellect, that brings us so near to the Deity, is subject to no law to direct and govern it in the attainment of truth, the chief object of that faculty, and in avoiding error, its principal evil. This cannot be, for such freedom would render impossible the acquisition of true knowledge and complete ignorance would be the unavoidable result. The whole Universe is subject to law and order. Look at the three kingdoms constituting our earthly habitation, the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal, and you will not find a single being that is not subject to the laws established by the Creator—man, therefore, the king of creation, cannot be an exception to the general appointed order. For this reason no human faculty is exempt from law: liberty has its laws taught by the science of ethics; man's intellect is governed by the science and art of logic directing it to the attainment of truth and the detection of error, and so it is of all other fields of knowledge.

When people are engaged in discussing some question, what, after all, does each disputant claim but this, that his view should prevail, because agreeing with the laws of truth, and that of his rival ought to be rejected, because conflicting with them? What is our thought but the act seeking truth, to whose rules it must conform to avoid error? Does our intellect depend on truth, or does truth depend on our intellect? Were we to assent to the latter alternative, it would follow that we should hold as true every absurdity entertained by any deranged human brain. Moreover, it has been rightly said that the human will is a blind faculty in constant need of the guiding light of the intellect in the choice of its objects and the performance of its operations. Give us an intellect free from all restraint and subject to no rule directing its acts, and what will then be the condition of the will? It will feel itself likewise free from all control, from all duties; it will be unable to attain its essential object, good and happiness, with total disorder as the inevitable result.

Does not experience tell us that our thoughts are subject to error, liable to stray from truth and to adhere to falsehood? This undeniable fact shows the absolute necessity of some laws to rule, guide and govern it in its acts; laws ultimately traced to the wisdom and intelligence of the Creator, who imparted them to human reason; laws discovered and elaborated by the genius of man.

268. Coming now to a practical application of the principle stated above, we ask: Are our judgments free? Yes, they are free whenever the rules of evidence are neglected. To claim such freedom renders our judgments worthless. Our judgments, if they are to have any validity, must follow some fixed laws of thought under pain, if neglected, of teaching error and talking nonsense. It is clear then that what we assert should be based upon the rules which logicians, historians and philosophers have drawn up for the safe guidance of our mind in the quest of truth.

We may lay it down as a self-evident proposition that when science, or knowledge in any branch of learning comes

in, Free Thought goes out. "The only thought that is free is the thought that is not yet bound down by certain knowledge, and a man is a Freethinker only in proportion to his ignorance. Only those ignorant of astronomy are free to think that the earth is bigger than the sun. The most perfect Freethinker is he whose mind is deranged, and he who knows most is least free in thought. The most perfect thought is that of the most learned men, and the more a man learns the more does he narrow the confines of the world of speculative matter where thought is free only by defect of evidence. Nor can Free Thought be held as free from the influence of other minds, from the authority of any teacher. If a teacher be reliable and accessible, then ignorance is legitimately expelled, and knowledge lawfully acquired by his pupils. It is reasonable to accept knowledge from one who knows; it is folly to repudiate the wisdom that comes of learning from wise teachers. Freethought is a fallacy. That knowledge which is claimed to be free is no true knowledge but ignorance, or prejudice or wild hypothesis posing as scientific fact. "To bring a concrete example, a Catholic does not set aside his reason; he is the true rationalist in the best sense of the word, for his attitude is one that is eminently reasonable. Reason guides him to the knowledge of God's existence. Reason teaches him that the Gospels are genuine, reliable, historical documents, and it is reason that convinces him that Christ is the Son of God, even as it convinces him that Napoleon I was a great leader of men. Nor does reason stop here, for examining the message of Him, to whom it points as the Divine Messenger, reason again proclaims a dogmatic Christianity as the necessary outcome of revelation. And infallibility itself is approved as the truly necessary and reasonable condition of faith." (Woodlock, cited above.)

But let us return to our main subject. From the days of our youth, when we began to study, and all through life, we have been all along engaged in setting boundaries to freedom of thought, for whenever we have attained some definite truth, ascertained a given historical fact, or learned any discovery of science, we ceased to be at liberty to reject such truths

under pain of plunging back into the dark region of ignorance, from which the right guidance of our thoughts had delivered us.

A forcible argument for disproving the Protestant rule of Faith, free individual interpretation of God's own word, is the fact that it allows, nay sanctions, a destructive liberty of thought. Liberty is, no doubt, a priceless blessing, but uncontrolled liberty of thought in morals and religion, far from being a blessing, may be turned into a veritable curse. If the explanation of the great truths which God has made known to us, through His authorized messengers and through His own Divine Son, were to be deductions of human reason, then man's intelligence might be competent to interpret them. But being God's own revelation, they have been entrusted for their safe, unerring interpretation to an authority guaranteed against error. The contrary system, as sad experience of three centuries proves, is total doctrinal disruption, culminating, in our days, in the vagaries and subversive theory of the Modernists, engaged in a fierce, deadly struggle against the Fundamentalists.

This system is evidently antagonistic to that of the Catholic Church. A Catholic believes on the authority of the Church in all revealed Christian truths, not because by philosophical, historical or scientific investigations he has convinced himself on such points, but because he is so taught by a teacher whom he accepts as divinely authorized to impart to him the truth. Has a loyal Catholic become an intellectual slave because, leaning on an infallible teacher, he is saved from becoming the victim of error and deception? To say that belief based on authority is of its very nature irrational is to contradict common sense and rest one's argument on a manifestly unreasonable principle. Of course, the Catholic believer must be ready to show sufficient grounds for his acceptance of the authority in which he puts his trust. The demonstration of the trustworthiness of authority is just as much a matter for rational argument as anything else; and the fundamental point from which the Catholic starts is that reason establishes the genuine and fully reliable character of

the authority to which he submits himself. This demonstration need not be stated here, as it has been thoroughly established above in Parts VI and VII, to which the reader is referred.

269. The foregoing reflections are deemed sufficient to pull down the whole scaffolding of futile charges urged by Freethinkers against the Catholic Church and her members. Here are some specimens:

(a) The Catholic Church fetters human liberty.

(b) She keeps man's intellect enchained.

(c) Catholics are the slaves of dogmas.

(d) Catholics cannot think for themselves, but according to orders.

American Catholics fairly acquainted with the recent history of our Church in this country must remember the late Dr. Orestes Brownson, that giant intellect, a convert to the Catholic Church to whose defense he consecrated the best years of his life. Here is what he says of the full liberty he enjoyed ever since he received the grace of joining her flock. "I have been constantly engaged in the study of the Church and her doctrines, but I have never found a single article, dogma or definition of faith which embarrassed me as a logician. I have never found my reason struggling against the teachings of the Church, or felt it restrained, or myself reduced to a state of mental slavery. I have, as a Catholic, felt and enjoyed an intellectual freedom, which I never conceived possible, while I was a non-Catholic." (The Convert.) We are told that freedom of thought and Catholic dogmas are incompatible, nay, absolutely irreconcilable. We admit the charge, and we do it for the best of reasons. What are Catholic dogmas? They are divinely revealed truths which God imposes on our belief through the unerring authority of His Church. Now truth is absolutely unchangeable. It is in fact coeternal with God, on whose immutable nature it essentially depends. The theorems of mathematics were true long before Euclid undertook to study them, and shall continue to be true even when no mathematician shall remain on the face of our planet. And this is so with every truth, metaphysical,

physical or moral. Man's subjective ideas and opinion of things can indeed be changed, for they may not be true; but their objective concepts are absolutely immutable.

I trust that the present discussion has clearly stated and explained the attitude of the Catholic Church toward liberty of thought. The Son of God came on earth to teach what He had heard from the Father. *"My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me"* (John 7, 16); and therefore, to limit the vagaries of unrestrained thought, He Himself proclaimed in His Father's name the truths to be believed and the law to be observed. After His declaration we are not free to trust the erring interpretation of our judgment. The same divine Son, before departing from this world, commissioned twelve men to teach all He Himself had taught: *"The Paraclete will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you"* (John 14, 26), and to teach it until the end of time. Evidently those individual men could not teach until the end of time by themselves. They are all in heaven, enjoying the reward of their apostolate crowned with martyrdom. Therefore the divine mandate was to be handed on to their legitimate successors. Whenever something that contradicts the declaration of Christ is taught by anyone, the Catholic Church is bound to condemn it, just as Christ condemns it. This is the extent of the limitation which she imposes on the freedom of thought, a limitation intended to deliver man from error by imparting to him the knowledge of truth.

CHAPTER III

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

270. When the gifted but unfortunate Thomas Chatterton (1770) was starting out for London to seek his fortune, and picturing to himself various plans for the attainment of his object, there was one which assumed a very distinct and practical shape, and which he hoped would save him from starvation. This was, in case all his literary efforts failed, to become a ranting preacher. "Credulity is," he wrote, "as potent a deity as ever, and a new sect may easily be devised." Any smart fellow with a facile imagination and what is commonly called "the gift of the gab," might manage to make a living by starting a new sect, if he made up his mind to work on the extraordinary gullibility of the public. The foundation of new religious sects, which are counted by the hundreds in Germany, England, the United States and other countries, is but one among the many vagaries of private judgment in the interpretation of the Bible. It is my purpose to call the reader's attention to one of the latest, Christian Science, which claims as its foundress and teacher the late Mrs. M. B. G. Eddy. It is not with any feeling of trifling over a grave subject, religion, that I do so. More in sorrow than in anger, much less with any feeling of scorn or contempt, do I undertake to point out the truly lamentable consequences which fall heavily on many deluded people who will not have the Gospel preached to them according to the wise plan ordained by our divine Savior, "*and will turn away indeed their hearing from the truth, and will be turned to fables.*" (II Timothy, 4, 4.) The St. Louis *Fortnightly Review,* for January 23, 1902, p. 43, in its brief notice of Rev. Van der Donckt's sprightly pamphlet, to be quoted hereafter, makes these pertinent remarks: "Christian Science, the latest and most dangerous superstition, is spreading more and more.

Even some Catholics have been beguiled, as this new error appears *sub specie boni,* under pretence of confidence in prayer; it is the evil one transformed into 'an angel of light,' hence all the more insidious.'' Father Van der Donckt ably proves that the fundamental principles of Mrs. Eddy's system are the same as some of the blasphemies of Ingersoll, the flippant American infidel already gone to his account; and that the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, free will, sin and hell, and other doctrines of the Christian religion, are denied by this false prophetess. It is important to instruct the people on this recent fraud, and make them understand that ''Christian Science is neither Science nor Christian, but a hypocritical, pernicious and ridiculous movement.'' Frederick W. Peabody, of the Boston Bar, in a lecture on Mrs. Eddy, describes her life, character and methods of business, and proves that she was a shrewd, cunning, unprincipled adventuress, who used her profound knowledge of the credulity and gullibility of her followers to amass a large fortune, and that she was reckoned as the ablest and most successful fraud of modern times. We are dealing with the false principles of this new sect, which ignorant or deluded people embrace as a most comfortable substitute to what is to them irksome Christianity, and therefore confine ourselves to showing the fallacy and absurdity of those principles, and their glaring contradictions with one another.

We hope that they may find out before it is too late that they are the miserable dupes and victims of a self-conceited charlatan who posed as a metaphysical prodigy and Christian teacher and expounder of a newfangled creed. Can they safely trust the eternal interests of their immortal souls to the new prophetess? Where are her credentials to prove that she had been divinely authorized to preach her new gospel, a tissue of absurdities and contradictions repugnant alike to sound reason and revealed Faith?

Let us see what claims she had to designate her absurd and contradictory creed as Christian. The leading, fundamental doctrines of Christianity as embodied in the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed constitute the belief or Faith

admitted by all Christians worthy of the name. Let us compare it with her teachings on each article as contained in her official bible or gospel, "Science and Health," 143d edition, from which we borrow our quotations. We shall have recourse to what is called "the deadly parallel," which will enable our readers to determine for themselves at a glance what they should think of such stuff as Mrs. Eddy and her deceived followers have propounded as tenets of their newly-coined creed.

The Apostles' Christian Creed	Christian Scientists Have No Religious Creed (p. 496)
Art. 1. I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and earth.	Art. 1. God is no Creator, for the Universe, inclusive of man, is as eternal as God (pp. 554, 336, 119). There is neither Father nor Son nor Holy Ghost, for the theory of three Persons in one God, that is, a personal Trinity, leads to Polytheism (p. 256). My Trinity is Life, Truth and Love (p. 459).
Art. 2. And in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord.	Art. 2. Jesus is the human man, and Christ is the divine idea (p. 493). Jesus is the name of the man. (See I John 4, 3. Every spirit that dissolves Jesus, is not of God.)
Art. 3. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.	Art. 3. As Christ is not God, Mary cannot be said to be the Mother of God (p. 473).
Art. 4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, died and was buried.	Art. 4. Christ did not suffer for He did not admit the existence of pain. He did not die, for He was alive in the grave. Quoted by Rev. C. Van der Donckt in "Christian Science Tested" (p. 33).
Art. 5. He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead.	Art. 5. He did not rise, since He did not die. (See above, pp. 33, 34.)
Art. 6. He ascended into Heaven; sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty.	Art. 6. Ascension means that He disappeared to material sense. Van der Donckt (*op. cit.*, p. 69).
Art. 7. From thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.	Art. 7. No final judgment awaits mortals (*op. cit.*, p. 69).
Art. 8. I believe in the Holy Ghost.	Art. 8. There exists no Holy Ghost, as there is no Trinity (pp. 256, 459).

Art. 9. The Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints.	Art. 9. The old historic Catholic Church has been replaced for Christian Scientists by Mrs. Eddy's Mother Church in Boston (p. 238).
Art. 10. The forgiveness of sin.	Art. 11. No forgiveness is needed, for Sin is an unconscious error (p. 188). Man is incapable of *sin*, sickness and death (p. 475).
Art. 11. The resurrection of the body.	Art. 11. The belief in the resurrection of the body, as taught by St. Paul (I Corinth. 15, 42–54) is erroneous. Van der Donckt (*op. cit.*, p. 69).
Art. 12. And life everlasting.	Art. 12. Mrs. Eddy denies the life everlasting hoped for by the faithful Christian. Van der Donckt (*op. cit.*, p. 69).

This last article implies also the Christian belief in the reality of a future life, of eternal happiness for the just, and eternal sufferings for the reprobates. As to the state of the latter, Mrs. Eddy does not attempt to disprove the existence of hell; she everywhere takes its non-existence for granted. The terrible words of the Supreme Judge (Mark 9, 42–47) do not trouble her. To deny the existence of Hell is to remove the strongest safeguard of virtue.

If the preceding comparison or contrast is not sufficient to convince any Christian of the fact that Christian Science and its adherents reject every article of the Apostles' Creed and can no more be called Christian than Mahometanism, Judaism, or Unitarianism deserves that name, no other argument will disabuse them of their blundering belief.

By such heretical assertions, and numberless philosophical, theological and moral blunders, such as that: Christ is eternal, Jesus is mortal, Christ is the Holy Ghost, the mind of man is identical with God, there is no such thing as free will, and other countless errors bristling throughout the cited volume, it is shown that Christian Science is as indescribable a jumble of arrant absurdities as an inmate of an insane asylum could ever have written. The conviction is then forced on us that the late Mrs. Eddy, the prophetess of ill omen, was an irreverent joker or a most intolerable scoffer.

As Eddyism is the denial and the antipodism of every

article of the Apostles' Creed, it is evident that no one can accept the unscriptural, antichristian and nonsensical vagaries of Mrs. Eddy and still call himself a Christian. Consequently, while Eddyism may save its deluded disciples some drugs and doctors' bills, it certainly does promote the undertaker's business; but it can no more fit souls for Heaven than the so-called mortal mind can fly to the moon. Away, then, with that ancient paganism that seeks to rise from its ashes under the deceptive name of Christian Science! Away with that creed of despair that would rob the sufferer of all solace arising from the hope of the reward held out by Christian Faith! Away with that vaporing, illuding sophistry that would take from those who strive to lead virtuous lives the stimulus or incentive to persevering exertion by blasting the expectation of eternal reward; while, by removing the fear of hell, it would free wrong-doers from the mightiest check in their wicked career! On the contrary, praised and thanked be forever our dear Lord Jesus Christ for having brought us through His Gospel from the heathen darkness of error to His admirable light of divine truth! (I Pet. 2, 9.)

271. It is not hard to account for the few extraordinary cures which are said to have been obtained by Christian Scientist faith healers, without any medical aid. As Dr. J. M. Buckley remarks in one of his lectures, only those unacquainted with the latent resources of human vitality find the problem difficult. Without any theory or practice of Christian Science methods millions of the poor living in scattered regions, in time of pestilence, have recovered without medical assistance, the *vis medicatrix naturæ,* nature's healing power, bringing them through. As to the supposed healing power of Christian Science, let us remember that the recuperative force of nature is truly the greatest conqueror of disease, and the mighty preserver of health. In many cases, well known to the medical profession, under ordinary circumstances, if left alone, the patient will recover. On such occasions any treatment, even that of faith healer, will receive credit for a cure or recovery due to nature alone. The late Dr. Austin Flint, in his great work, "The Principles and

Practice of Medicine," says: "Diseases, which were formerly supposed to tend to a fatal result, if not treated by means of active remedies, are now known to end generally in recovery, if left alone." Hence all that Christian Scientists seem to achieve is done by those hidden springs of nature's recuperative powers. On the other hand, we must not overlook the fact that the failures of Christian Scientists and faith healers are innumerable, and we have yet to hear of their having restored the sight to the born blind, or life to the dead. Many who have been vainly treated by Christian Scientists are now lying in their untimely graves. There would not be so much regret if the victims of these insane methods were restricted to the advocates themselves of the irrational system of faith cure; they would simply reap what they themselves have sown. But is it not the height of cruelty to cause the untimely death of hundreds of individuals, children and members of the poorer classes, whose lives could have been saved by prompt medical aid? Why do not our legislators frame laws that will save the lives of thousands of innocent members of society, and protect the honor and interests of the honest medical profession?

In this connection our readers will be surprised at reading the following information that came to our knowledge from Vancouver, British Columbia, dated December, 1922. "Of 350 persons pronounced to have been cured by the Rev. C. S. Price who operated in this city as an evangelist and faith-healer, 214 experienced no change, 39 died within six months, 17 grew decidedly worse and 5 became insane, according to a report by an investigating committee which was published. The five that were listed as cured were said to have suffered from functional disorders. The Committee included 11 clergymen of several denominations, 8 physicians, who are members of Christian Churches and were declared to be specialists in diseases afflicting the 350 patients, 3 university professors and one lawyer. The report was presented at the meeting of the general Ministerial Association of Vancouver." Comment is needless.

Additional Strictures on the Aberration Exposed in This Chapter

The fact of God's revelation to men of the truths to be believed and of the laws to be observed for their everlasting salvation is the common inheritance and belief of mankind. Mrs. Eddy was the unprincipled woman that appealed to human credulity to palm off her creed as a new revelation with which Heaven favored her in the year 1866. Nine years after appeared the first edition of "Science and Health," a book whose contents, from beginning to end, are in hopeless conflict with God's own word revealed in Holy Scripture. To this she was led by her boldness, irreverence, recklessness and the blasphemy of her pretended intimacy with God. But the new personal revelation needed revision, which was accomplished by herself within two years, for she herself informs us that she undertook the laborious task of censoring, remodeling, changing and fitting up the newly revealed doctrine, Christian Science, so as to present to modern society an up-to-date religion suitable to our times. To cap the climax, Mrs. Eddy went so far as to place "her precious volume" above the Bible itself. "Even the Scriptures," she declares, "gave no direct interpretation of the scientific basis for demonstrating the spiritual Principle of healing, until our Heavenly Father saw fit, through the Key of the Scriptures in Science and Health, to unlock the mystery of godliness." (Science and Health, pp. 559–562.)

But, it would seem that the inspired dame can scarcely be blamed for preferring her "precious volume," so she styles it, to the whole Bible, for, after all, is it not the last revelation of God's will, manifested to her, that holds?

Among the great treasures contained in the teachings of the divine Savior is reckoned the Lord's Prayer, the sublimest invocation ever heard upon earth. It is a masterpiece, worthy of its Teacher, as it contains, in its admirable brevity, all the graces and favors, which we poor mortals may need implore from our heavenly Father, the order in which our petitions should be presented, and the chief reason guaranteeing the success of our supplications. Here also the impertinent

woman dared to lay her sacrilegious pen on those sacred utterances by a veritable caricature which she calls "a scientific interpretation of the Lord's prayer." As Rev. A. M. Bellwald, S.M., remarks in his excellent work, "Christian Science and the Catholic Faith," p. 191, "four of the petitions have been changed into affirmations; the reference to the divine will, in which Mrs. Eddy does not believe, and to obedience to it, has been dropped. The word bread, which sounded too material, has been replaced by a reference to grace and famished affections; and finally the change that shocks most of all, is the change of "Our Father" into "Our Father-Mother God." As one of the numerous inconsistencies and contradictions she interprets the sixth petition thus, "Deliver us from sin, disease and death," asking to be freed from the very things which she repeatedly affirms in her writings do not exist.

272. As to the moral influence of the Christian Science doctrine, it must be said that the denial of the very possibility of sin logically sweeps away all barriers against the flesh, and opens wide the gates for sensuality and voluptuousness to flood the soul. If Christian Scientists do not give way to this tendency, it is because they are wisely inconsistent and are better than their doctrine. That the ethical code of Christian Science, which represents a refined Epicureanism, cannot but lower the standard of morality by its denial of the very existence of sin, is a fact beyond dispute. As in the Christian Science system, if it deserves to be so called, the supernatural is banished out of existence, so the supernatural character of Christ's miracles goes out with it. Mrs. Eddy showed herself more drastic than the sixteenth-century Reformers themselves, who out of the seven Sacraments retained Baptism, and in name, at least, Holy Eucharist, which they mutilated and transformed into the Lord's Supper. According to her interpretation of the new heavenly revelation imparted to her, the Baptism of water and the Holy Ghost instituted by Christ and practiced by all Christian nations during the last nineteen hundred years, is now out of date, for, Mrs. Eddy writes, "our Baptism is purification from all error."

(Science and Health, p. 35.) In a similar manner the Holy Eucharist is spirited away. She blasphemously writes: "The material blood of Jesus was no more efficacious to cleanse from sin when it was shed upon the accursed tree, than when it was flowing in His veins, as He went daily about His Father's business. Our bread 'which cometh down from Heaven' is Truth." Hence she consistently lays down this rule "The Mother Church of Christ, Scientist, shall observe no more communion seasons." (Church Manual, Art. XVIII, sect. 1.) (In Bellwald's cited work, p. 178.) But there is practically no end to this conglomeration of heresies. Logic, common sense, reason and truth can have no place in such a system, a glaring misnomer, for, as we have shown above (n. 271), it is not Christian but the antipodes of Christianity; and it is the very reverse of scientific, since it rejects the foundation of science, the trustworthiness of our sensitive faculties, which supply the mental images necessary for the operations of the intellect. As men have always and everywhere believed in the evidence of the senses as wholly reliable, while Christian Scientists reject it, it follows that all men, in all times, Mrs. Eddy and her followers excepted, have been victims of a gigantic delusion. Christian Scientists must denounce as erroneous the collective wisdom of the past and replace it by the unwarranted claims of Mother Eddy, whose powers no human being outside an insane asylum ever pretended to possess.

Atheists, Agnostics and Deists might consistently become her disciples; but no Christian worthy of the name can accept her blundering theology without making shipwreck of his Faith.

I sincerely trust that my readers share with me the conviction that of all delusions in matters of religion, which have at any time gained credence among apparently intelligent people, the most irrational and, alas! fatal is that of Christian Science, from which may the merciful Lord deliver us.

Whatever merit the reader finds in this last paragraph of the present chapter, he must attribute principally to the Rev. A. Bellwald, S.M., S.T.L., Professor of Theology at the

Marist College, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., author of "Christian Science and Catholic Faith."

We are told that the creed numbers now many thousand adherents, and, as stated by the New York *Sun*, it is accepted and professed chiefly by the upper classes. Evidently the poor have not the Gospel preached to them in this cult. If that be true, there is a benign Providence watching over the poor and preserving them from an illusion calculated to render their lot doubly miserable here and hereafter. The sorry sight that all this presents, furnishes us an object lesson of the harm that religious error does to humanity. Sometimes it leads to furious, brutal and degrading excesses, at others it makes guys of the victims, at least in the opening stages of the delusion. Once we start wrong, the conditions rapidly deteriorate and folly is often a prelude to crime. To possess the truth; to know whence we come and whither we are going; what are our opportunities and what our obligations; to have the secret of converting the sorrows of life into opportunities of happiness—this is what the Catholic Faith alone can give. This is Christian Science, but it is not Mrs. Eddy's, whose blasphemy is not Christian, and whose inanity is not science.

CHAPTER IV

A SAFE VIEW OF SPIRITISM FOR CATHOLICS

§ I. Timely Importance of This Subject

273. Spiritism is the name properly given to the belief that the living can and do communicate with the spirits or souls of the departed. Its main purpose is to ascertain what is their experience beyond the grave, and to find out whether it corresponds with the teachings of Christianity both as regards this life and the next. Another object is also to satisfy the morbid curiosity of inquirers concerning the knowledge of other secret things.

This practice of consulting the dead is generally carried out through the intervention of the so-called mediums, living persons, who are said to be more or less susceptible to the influence of the supposed spirits of the dead, and they act as intermediaries in receiving and transmitting their communications. We advisedly say generally, for, as will be shown in the sequel, the presence of a medium is not absolutely necessary for the evocation of spiritistic manifestations.

Though such performances are also designated by the word Spiritualism, yet, to avoid confusion, it is better to reserve said term to signify the philosophical doctrine which holds that there exists a spiritual order of beings no less real than the material, and in particular that the human soul is a spiritual and therefore intelligent and immortal substance.

Modern Spiritism within a generation has passed beyond the limits of a merely popular movement, mainly prompted by sentimental curiosity, to serious inquiry, and as such has challenged the attention of the upholders of Christianity, and of the scientific world. On this account it is becoming every day more obviously impossible for any educated person to dismiss the subjects of Spiritism with mere contempt. The following are the main points to be discussed.

1. What are the chief spiritistic phenomena?
2. Should we accept many of them as true, genuine facts?
3. How can they be rationally accounted for?

Of the phenomena some belong to the physical or material order of things, while others must be ascribed to intellectual agencies, whatever they may be.

1. Physical Facts. Objects, which could hardly be moved by several men, are easily lifted and transported instantaneously from remote distances by the medium. Musical instruments are played without being touched by any one. Heavy bodies are seen suspended and floating in the air without any visible support. The alteration of weights of bodies from eight pounds to forty pounds, a fact testified by an eminent scientist, the late Sir William Crookes, who wrote: "I had the entire management of this experimental trial, employed an instrument of great accuracy and took every care to exclude the possibility of trickery." Dr. H. Carrington bears testimony to the opposite phenomenon, the loss of weight. He writes: "During the experiments in Milan it was found that the medium in about twenty seconds had lost no less than seventeen pounds."

But what is considered the triumph of Spiritism is the wonder of materialization, which consists in the actual appearance in its full bodily form of a supposed discarnate soul, that moves about clothed in a kind of silk drapery, speaks to the sitters in audible whispers, and, after a time, gradually melts away before their eyes.

The mediums give answers which absolutely exceed the well-known limits of their culture, they speak ancient and modern languages at the bidding of the experimenters, solve intricate mathematical problems and perform other feats which only a superior intelligence could accomplish. The following is a case in point:

The great English astronomer, the late John F. Herschel, at first called Spiritism sheer quackery. A friend of his invited him to a *séance* to be held in clear daylight so as to exclude any attempt at trickery or jugglery of any kind. The medium purposely chosen was a countrywoman utterly desti-

tute of education. As soon as she had fallen into the usual trance, the astronomer, bent on unmasking her, questioned her concerning certain intricate mathematical problems which he himself had solved. She answered that the calculations of Herschel were wrong, and stated what corrections should be made. The astronomer laughed as an unbeliever. But what happened? Some time after, going over his figures, he found that the medium was right, and he was honest enough to acknowledge his mistake in the public press.

If space permitted it, other similar instances might be alleged; but the preceding ones will suffice for our purpose.

2. Are many such phenomena real facts?

As medicine has its quacks, science its impostors, commercial trade its frauds, so Spiritism may, at times, have been found guilty of jugglery, and palmed off its trickery as genuine wonders, thus deceiving unwary and gullible folks. But this fact does not warrant sweeping denial of all the doings of Spiritism. Such a conclusion would be both illogical and unfair, and would moreover brand as dishonest, mean impostors a large multitude of fair-minded witnesses of spiritistic wonders. In spite of occasional exposure, there occur phenomena which cannot be ascribed to fraud of any sort.

This view is shared by men whose knowledge and integrity is altogether above suspicion. The experiments they relate as eyewitnesses, the severe tests to which they have been put, the many precautions taken to avoid all possible deception, vouch with absolute certainty for the undeniable reality of spiritistic marvels. Hence we fully endorse the view of Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., expressed in an article on the peril of Spiritism published in the London *Weekly Universe*:

"I believe that, in spite of much trickery, astounding manifestations, which cannot be other than preternatural, casually occur. It seems to me that no human testimony can avail to establish any historical fact at all if we are to set aside the evidence for these happenings."

As the late Father Richard Clarke, S.J., wrote in *The Month* for September, 1892, "The strange phenomena and

feats of Spiritism are not a mere imposture. After reading the report of the Dialectical Society, the interesting book published by Mr. A. R. Wallace, the naturalist, or Professor De Morgan's 'From Matter to Spirit,' or the hundred other volumes on this topic, we reach the inevitable conclusion that marvellous physical effects are produced, which cannot be due to any natural forces whatever, and must be attributed to the presence of some superhuman and invisible intelligence, through whose agency they are brought about. Mr. Challis, Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge says: (Miracles and Modern Spiritism, p. 99) 'The testimony to these extraordinary phenomena has been so abundant and spontaneous, that either the facts must be admitted to be such as are reported, or the possibility of certifying facts must be given up.' The facts being thus indisputable, and their origin or cause being some spiritual, invisible and preternatural agency, the question that presents itself for solution is to ascertain the character of this agency. There are, it is true, some persons who are proof against all the evidence that has been adduced on the subject. We need not trouble ourselves with the refutation of these hardy skeptics. There are some educated persons who, in spite of all the arguments brought by astronomers and mathematicians, still assert that the sun moves around the earth; we may relegate to the same class those who assert that all the marvels of Spiritism are sheer impostures.''

Instead, therefore, of cutting off the vexatious problem by a sweeping, irrational denial, we deem it a wiser and braver course to grapple with it, and endeavor to reach a reasonable and satisfactory solution. Hence we cannot approve the conduct of certain modern scientists who either deny the facts, which are shown to be true, or thrust them aside as unworthy of serious investigation.

3. The Spiritists will admit, with all level-headed men, that nobody can give what he has not, and that a reasonable cause must be assigned to Spiritism; for to resort continually to unknown causes as a justification of our ignorance, does not offer a rational explanation accounting satisfactorily for

facts the reality of which cannot be denied except by obstinate skeptics.

In accordance with the claims of reason and common sense, every event must have a cause; every effect calls for an efficient cause, force, or agent able to produce it. On this all are agreed, the only practical difference in the various explanations of the facts of Spiritism consists in the nature of that cause.

Among the possible causes, fairly covering the whole ground, the following have been advocated by different writers, and the disciples of several spiritistic schools:

(*a*) Almighty God Himself through the ministry of the good angels.

(*b*) The extraordinary achievements of the medium when in a trance.

(*c*) Some mysterious as yet unknown natural agent or force, the theory of some modern scientists.

(*d*) The so-called discarnate souls of the dead as held by the upholders of Spiritism.

(*e*) The evil spirits, Satan and the fallen angels called demons: the firm belief, as will be proved, of all conservative Christians and of all the defenders of sacred Scripture.

For clearness' sake we shall adopt in this discussion in our next article the process of elimination and allege several cogent reasons why, after rejecting as unsatisfactory all other causes, it must be admitted that the spiritistic phenomena ought to be attributed only and exclusively to devilish intervention.

The facts shown to be taking place in connection with recent experimental research are many and wonderful, and they present problems of the greatest importance and significance. It is only the earnest, unprejudiced study of them in the light of divine revelation and sound reason that can lead the inquiring mind to a discovery of the real agents responsible for the production of the spiritistic marvels, and thus enable it to determine the question as to the lawfulness and morality of the practice of Spiritism.

§ II. The True Cause or Agency of Certain Spiritistic Phenomena

274. The purpose we have in view is to set forth as clearly and concisely as possible the orthodox doctrine on Spiritism; a doctrine held not only by Catholics, but also by all consistent believers in historic Christianity, where alone we find the true standard by which the momentous problems presented by that so-called new religion can be fairly and adequately solved, and the inquiring mind led to the detection of the real agents responsible for the spiritistic marvels.

Such a knowledge, practically necessary in our days, will enable the reader to pronounce a correct judgment on the matter at issue, and on the teachings of the two leading spiritistic lights, Sir Oliver Lodge and Conan Doyle, prominent English writers. The latter, in a recent public lecture, was bold enough to give to his audience the horrible advice that all should become spiritistic mediums, an advice which the medical profession that respects itself will, no doubt, indignantly repudiate in the interest of health, religion and morality, menaced by Spiritism, as we shall show later.

The severe tests to which many spiritistic facts have been put, and the absolute trustworthiness of the experimenters vouch with certainty for their undeniable reality. It is now our task to pass in review each of the different causes proposed as explanatory of the doings of Spiritism, so as to ascertain to which of them they should be ascribed.

Some people, struck by the astounding wonders they witnessed at the *séances*, thought that they were the work of the Deity. Hence the need of the inquiry:

(1) Are the phenomena of Spiritism to be attributed to God?

The simple proposal of the question suggests the answer, which is an emphatic negative. They cannot be ascribed to God's immediate agency, who certainly is not to be supposed to be acting as a mere tool in the hands of His creatures, to obey their summons and operate wonders at their bidding to gratify their morbid curiosity.

Moreover, has not Almighty God forbidden, under the severest penalties both temporal and eternal, the superstitious practice of consulting the dead? The Lord thus spoke to the Israelites through the prophet Moses: *"Neither let it be found among you any one that consulteth pythonic spirits, or that seeketh the truth from the dead. For the Lord abhorreth these things."* (Deut. 18, 10–12.)

It is gratifying to see the orthodox doctrine on this point fully endorsed by the following Protestant testimony. More than thirty-four years ago, when modern Spiritism was in its infancy, the eminent Presbyterian divine, De Witt Talmage, inveighed against it with all the force of his eloquence: "What does God think of all these delusions? He thinks so severely that He never speaks of them but with livid thunders of indignation; for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord. After that be a Spiritist, if you dare."

The attitude of the Catholic Church towards the practice of Spiritism is uncompromising and unmistakable, as it appears from the two following decrees of the Holy Office: "To call up the souls of the dead is a deception absolutely unlawful, heretical, and scandalous." Approved by Pius IX in 1858. To the question whether it is lawful to be present at any spiritistic communication, even with no intention of dealing with wicked spirits, the answer was an emphatic negative, and bears the sanction of the Supreme Pontiff, Benedict XV, April 27, 1917.

Some wiseacres, who know as much about Spiritism as the average American about Oriental languages, think that the best solution of the vexed problem is simply to ridicule it. Our answer is that such an offhand explanation, to say nothing at present of its glaring absurdity, throws an impertinent reflection on the policy of the Catholic Church, who, instead of merely ridiculing Spiritism, thought it wise to denounce it, and assign the reasons for its condemnation.

(2) Are the facts of Spiritism to be assigned to good angels?

We take here for granted what Catholics and the generality of Christians hold concerning the holy angels, who, at

their trial, remained faithful and loyal to their Sovereign Creator, and are now partakers of heavenly happiness. Being perfectly united with their Lord, and entirely submissive to His holy will, they never use their power in doing what God hates and absolutely forbids. They fight with us against the common enemies, Satan and the rebel angels, the battles of the Lord, whose design they accomplish in our behalf. Hence it is certain that they have nothing to do with the abominable performances of the spiritistic *séances*.

(3) Shall we say that the mediums themselves are the authors of the astounding feats of Spiritism?

A number of scientists, particularly of materialists, determined to exclude anything preternatural, and much more the supernatural, confronted with the undeniable facts of Spiritism have devised explanations highly discreditable to science itself, because both silly and absurd. Hence their theories need only be stated to be refuted by any man of elementary knowledge and sound common sense. Their opinions differ so widely and are at times so contradictory that it seems quite useless to examine them. A few specimens will suffice.

Sir William Crookes speaks thus: "In some individuals acting as mediums there is an organism that enables them to work all the spiritistic wonders. It is called the *psychic* force."

Dr. Rickert writes: "The intellectual marvels witnessed at *séances* are the result of the astounding knowledge hidden in the mind of mediums, and exhibited by them when in a trance."

Others, especially the materialists of the medical fraternity, attribute all those phenomena to fits of hysteria and neurasthenia, or to a mysterious fluid emanating from the entranced medium. All such and similar theories are shown to be false by the fact admitted by the Spiritists themselves that all mediums, even the most clever, are simply instrumental channels of communication, entirely subject to the control and caprice of the real, though invisible, authors of the phenomena in question. It is well known that, at times, such communications are suddenly interrupted; what becomes

then of the psychic force, the latent knowledge and the mysterious fluid of the medium?

According to some theorists the action alone of the medium suffices to account for all spiritistic phenomena. There exists in man, they say, an astral substance of a nature between matter and spirit, which, if detached from the body of the medium affords a means of communication with the spirits. Mediumship therefore consists in the ability of a person to detach from his body this astral substance. Of the existence of this strange being as well as of the subliminal self and automatism, the so-called natural causes of spiritistic phenomena, not a shred of proof is adduced. As to the astral substance suffice it to say that a being which is neither spirit nor matter is simply a nonentity.

(4) Are the phenomena of Spiritism the work of some natural force or agency hitherto unknown to science?

The advocates of such view reason thus: "We do not know all the forces of organic and inorganic beings. Now, since science, always progressive, may discover in the course of time as a stern reality what we at present ignore, who knows but in the near future a hidden natural agent may be discovered and the now mysterious phenomena fully explained?"

We freely grant that the future may have wonderful surprises in store for us. In fact, what was considered an impossibility a century ago, is now a reality, wireless telegraphy. There is, however, at hand a principle to guide us, which is admitted by all, namely, that no effect can be superior to the cause producing it. The unbiassed inquirer cannot fail to see that blind natural forces are utterly unable to give rise to effects superior to themselves such as all the spiritistic marvels, the work not of blind, necessary agents, but of intelligent and free causes.

Common sense tells us that to speak different languages, both ancient and modern, to solve correctly intricate mathematical problems, to diagnose successfully complicated diseases cannot be the work of any natural forces, however powerful they may be (n. 273).

As recourse to as yet unknown physical or natural agents is the chief argument of our opponents, we deem it proper to demonstrate at greater length its absolute worthlessness from a philosophical point of view.

According to the present order of Providence, manifested by experience and observation, whatever force or agent acts within the limits of physical nature possesses the following fixed and unchangeable characters:

First. It is determined to one only particular effect—thus heat expands, and cold contracts, and the opposite can never occur.

Second. It is constant and uniform in its operations, for every natural force is governed by fixed, invariable laws.

Third. When the conditions required for its activity are present, it necessarily acts. Apply a flame to powder and the explosion is inevitable.

Fourth. In its operations it is entirely destitute of liberty or choice. Can we say that a lighted candle is free to burn or extinguish itself?

As none of these conditions are verified in the spiritistic phenomena, the observer is logically drawn to the conclusion that they cannot be ascribed to any known or unknown purely natural agency or force.

In fact, first in the spiritistic *séances* are seen substantially different effects, such as the physical, psychical, physiological and psychological wonders.

Secondly, there is no uniformity of action witnessed, for every operation has its own peculiar method, every method its varieties, and every variety its exceptions, all effects which obey no constant, fixed law.

Thirdly, when everything is ready for a spiritistic *séance*, are the expected manifestations always forthcoming at the bidding of the experimenter, or at the choice of the medium? By no means, for, at times, the performance must be either prolonged, or interrupted, or indefinitely postponed, on account of the caprice of the agents at work, whoever they be.

Fourthly, from what has just been said, the intellectual free action of the invisible agents is patent to all. Therefore

as all the characters of the spiritistic phenomena are essentially different from those of the physical, natural forces, it stands to reason to conclude that they cannot be attributed to any natural agent.

(5) Should we then agree with the Spiritists and ascribe the facts in question to the souls of the dead?

Here also we must answer in the negative. The principal reason is because such souls are utterly unable to perform either the physical or the intellectual deeds witnessed at the *séances.* In fact, all physical or mechanical performances require action on matter, which is naturally impossible to discarnate souls. As St. Thomas and many Catholic philosophers hold, pure spirits, whether angels or demons, not being determined to animate any particular bodily organism, have full power, though under God's control, to act on matter and work the material feats of Spiritism.

Human souls, on the contrary, when once separated from their body by death, retain no further power of action on matter. Neither can the souls of the dead operate any of the intellectual wonders; for the astounding answers given entirely exceed the well-known limits of the mental capacity which they possessed when living. (Eccles. 9, 10.)

Have the Spiritists ever proved that the mere fact of death transforms persons of average intelligence into prodigies of learning? Or shall we suppose that God Himself will infuse into departed souls the extraordinary knowledge displayed at the *séances,* and thus enable men to consult the dead and to do the very thing which He Himself so rigorously condemns? (Deut. 18, 10–12.)

Moreover, the trivialities, obscenities, blasphemies, and, at times, the expressions of hatred against the sitters are notorious and the Spiritists themselves deplore their occurrence. Can these abominable things be said to be the work of departed souls whose moral integrity in life, in some cases well known to the audience, makes them utterly incredible and absurd? That the astounding communications received at the *séances* do not come from the dead, but, from the fallen spirits, the demons, we learn from the Spiritists themselves. Allan

Kardec—formerly M. Rivail, the French standard-bearer of the new cult, in his book on mediums, writes that "any question may be asked at the *séance*. If it is beneath the superior dignity of a superior spirit to answer, an inferior spirit will always be at hand to satisfy the curiosity of the inquirer," although, he naïvely remarks, they are not conspicuous for truthfulness.

As will be shortly proved, a very strong argument against the presence of the souls of the departed at the spiritistic *séances* can be drawn from the views of the Spiritists themselves on this subject. According to the assertion of the invisible beings themselves, in their communications with the mediums, they are the spirits of the dead, who still hover around those they love, conveying to them information on all kinds of hidden subjects. Their account of their own condition is that they are all in a state of progress towards perfection and are undergoing a process of gradual purification. Their condition is one of development, evolution and continual advance. Some are in a state of peace and happiness by reason of a well-spent life. They hover about those whom they loved as their protectors and friends, warning them against dangers, inculcating noble desires and high aims. All the inhabitants of the spirit world will sooner or later shake off the imperfections and corruptions of earth and arrive at that state of final development, to which they are destined, and in which the moral and intellectual nature will have full play in the congenial sphere of all that is noble and intelligent. These spirits do grow in knowledge and goodness, and this through being reincarnated, thus returning to this earth many times, in fact as many as are necessary to grow to perfection. Every Catholic who reads this description of the invisible world, derived from the testimony of the spirits and held by the advocates of Spiritism, will at once recognize that it is incompatible with the teaching of the Church and of the Scripture. Several erroneous theories against Holy Scripture and the Church's teachings are implied in what seems a plausible and fair plan devised by Spiritists. First of all, it assumes the existence in the next

life of several new probations and consequent reincarnations of the departed souls, suppositions supported by no Scriptural testimony from Genesis to the Apocalypse. Hence no one need be surprised at the frank avowal of an American writer who states—"I have long searched with anxious solicitude for a text in the Bible which would even seem to favor the idea of a future probation. I cannot find it." ("Catholic Eschatology," by Oxenham, p. 145, note.) It evidently belonged to the Sovereign Creator and Supreme Judge to determine when and where the trial or probation of His rational creatures on earth should end, a disposition exclusively depending on His divine will. This He manifests to them in the clearest language of Holy Writ to the effect that their trial ends with their departure from this world, to be followed in the next by one of the three states of Dante's threefold vision, *Inferno* for the impenitent reprobates, *Purgatorio* for the just but imperfect, and *Paradiso* for the perfectly just.

We learn from God's own word that man's probation, the time of merit, of good works and acceptable repentance is limited to the period of his earthly existence. Hence, after death there shall be no sorrow, no penance available for salvation. Out of the many testimonies that might be adduced the following will suffice. *"When the wicked man is dead there shall be no hope any more."* (Prov. 11, 7.) *"For it is easy before God, on the day of death, to reward every one according to his ways."* (Ecclus. 11, 28.) *"Behold now is the acceptable time; behold now is the day of salvation."* (II Cor. 6, 2.)

Right reason can detect no injustice in the fact that the Supreme Lawgiver and Sovereign Lord has fixed a certain, determined length of time, commensurate with the duration of men's life on earth as the period of their probation, which being elapsed, there shall remain no further hope of pardon to sinners. In fact, can there be any injustice in this provision? Is God Almighty always to keep open the door of forgiveness in order that reckless men may never find closed the door of sin? By what right can man exact from God that He should never deny pardon to sinners? Is forgiveness

an obligation of justice, or a free act of mercy? It is true, as we know from divine revelation, that the Lord promised to forgive sinners whenever they would sincerely repent of their evil deeds and implore His mercy; but all such promises are positively limited to the present time, as proved in the scriptural testimonies alleged above.

Among the many authorities that could be alleged on behalf of the Catholic view the following will suffice for the present:

The famous French astronomer, Flammarion, thus replies to the Spiritists: "Their doctrine is far from being demonstrated. The innumerable observations which I have collected during more than forty years all prove to me the contrary. No satisfactory identification has ever been made. That human souls survive the destruction of the body by death, I have not a shadow of doubt. But that they manifest themselves by the processes employed in spiritistic *séances*, there has been no absolute proof."

(6) Are the doings of Spiritism the work of Satan and of his companions, the fallen angels?

After excluding all the preceding explanations as altogether unsatisfactory, there remains but one cause that fully accounts for the many spiritistic phenomena that cannot be ascribed to mere jugglery, and that is the presence and action of wicked angels, the demons.

But here I am confronted with an apparently unsurmountable difficulty, and it is this: Certain men who are supposed to be taken seriously do not believe at all in the existence of wicked angels. Speaking from the editorial pulpit they told us some time ago that Satan was a myth, and that it was impossible for believers in God to admit the existence of any so-called demons. We must be quite sure that there existed no such beings in creation, for the spirits said it themselves. In fact they advised Mr. Stainton Moses, a famous medium, "to cease to be perplexed about thoughts of imagined devils, for there is no devil or prince of devils such as theology has feigned."

But as this was said by lying spirits, we shall have to

admit the contrary as true and still believe with all Christians worthy of the name in the existence and the wicked doings of demons.

Glancing over the Bible's contents from Genesis to the Apocalypse, we find not less than fifty references to Satan and the rebel angels.

Jesus Christ gave evidence of His divine power by the expulsion of demons from hundreds of possessed and obsessed persons. On the theory of the non-existence of such creatures, Christ's miracles just mentioned were a huge fraud, and He actually played the hypocrite by pretending to expel devils that did not exist. No believer in the Bible can deny the existence of the wicked spirits, the devils, without stultifying himself.

In the days of the first Reformers (1600), when so many traditional doctrines were rudely called in question, the belief in the existence of fallen angels was found so deeply rooted in the Christian conscience of the Faithful that no attempt was made to deny that truth.

Dr. H. Carrington has this to say on the subject: "If anything could make me believe in the doctrine of evil, lying spirits, it would be the sittings I had when Mrs. Piper acted as a medium. I then gained the distinct impression that, instead of the souls of the personages she claimed to be present, I was dealing with exceedingly deceitful intelligences."

Stainton Moses, quoted above, giving his own experience, said of the agent at work in a *séance:* "It bespeaks a deeply evil nature. Such an impostor acting with an air of sincerity must be Satan clothed in light."

Catholics can have no hesitation in their belief in the existence and nefarious activities of demons. After Holy Mass, celebrated daily in countless churches throughout the world, by order of the Vicar of Christ, a public prayer is recited to implore the divine protection and the special assistance of the Archangel St. Michael against the malice and the snares of Satan and the other evil spirits who prowl about the world seeking the ruin of souls. Several other reasons will be adduced in the next article, in which we shall speak of the

many fatal dangers of Spiritism to religion, health and morality.

It has then been shown that devilish intervention is the only true cause of all real spiritistic phenomena. This conclusion is based on the teaching of all the leading Catholic theologians and moralists of the day. Their doctrine, both dogmatic and moral, constitutes the sacred science whose principles, founded on God's own revelation, are unchangeable and form the supreme standard of truth and morality.

Men of scientific attainment and upright character, after long and careful investigation, declare that certain physical and psychical phenomena of Spiritism witnessed by them cannot be explained by any cause known to science. Hence they freely admit that they surpass both nature's and man's powers and are therefore preternatural, due to free, intellectual agencies of a malignant character, as revealed by spiritistic results. They therefore fully justify the attitude of the Catholic Church in denouncing the pernicious influence of spiritistic practices, and in warning men against the physical, religious and moral dangers attending them. Therefore modern scientific investigators, if they wish to steer clear of erroneous views, should be careful not to advance any statement that runs counter to revealed truth.

275. To account for both the physical and intellectual feats exhibited in the spiritistic performances, we must briefly recall what orthodox theology teaches us regarding the endowment of angels, their extraordinary, superhuman knowledge and power.

As in men so in angels we must carefully distinguish the natural from the supernatural gifts bestowed on them by their Sovereign Creator and Supreme Benefactor. The chief supernatural gift conferred on the angelic multitude was sanctifying grace, which elevated them to a most intimate union with their Maker and fitted them for the heavenly happiness of the beatific vision, attainable on condition of their loyalty and submission to the Lord's will, the test of their fidelity. The precious gift of grace Lucifer and his followers forfeited forever by their sin and rebellion. But as to the mere natural

gifts, constituting the very essence of pure spirits, they remained to them full and unimpaired. They are principally two, extraordinary knowledge and power far superior to those possessed by even the most gifted men. As to knowledge, they possess such penetration as to be able by a single glance to take in the whole field of science both physical and rational along with its numerous branches. However vast may be the comprehension of the angelic mind, it is restricted by two most important limits.

First, it cannot know with certainty future events that depend on the free action of God or man.

Second, it can have no sure knowledge of man's inner thoughts, called the secrets of the hearts.

Hence utterances on such matters, often heard in spiritistic *séances,* are mere wild guesses or downright falsehoods intended by the lying spirits to deceive the illuded experimenters and the assembled sitters.

A very striking proof of the formidable power of angels is the event related in Holy Scripture, when one single angel slew in one night 185,000 soldiers of the Assyrian army of the impious King Sennacherib, who had defied the God of Israel to save Jerusalem from destruction. (IV Kings 19, 35.) Sincere Christian believers have nothing to fear from the power of the good angels, of whom St. Paul writes: *"Are they not all ministering spirits sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?"* (Heb. 1, 14.) We can have no surer guarantee of assistance against the conspiracy of demons than the fear and love of God, of Him whose tenderness for His loyal servants is infinite and whose power is almighty.

On the other hand, as Christian doctrine teaches us, the wicked angels, the sworn enemies of mankind, impelled by their hatred of God, and the envy of men, are ever ready to make use of their astounding power against us. They are, however, subject to the full control of divine Omnipotence for the maintenance and preservation of the physical, moral, social and spiritual order of the world. Hence the devil's power also has its limitations, which have been providentially

fixed by Almighty God, and beyond which it is impossible for him to act. But if men, in defiance of the peremptory divine prohibition, wilfully and of their own accord place themselves within the reach of the evil influence of Satan and his satellites, the wicked angels, by meddling with spiritistic practices, all know who is to blame if they fall victims to such dreadful calamities as are described below in § III.

When, therefore, we take into account the prodigious knowledge and great power naturally possessed by the fallen angels, the demons, we need not be surprised at the astounding physical and intellectual wonders displayed in spiritistic meetings; remarkable wonders indeed, which can in no wise be attributed to the presence and action of the dead for the all-sufficient reason that they possess neither the knowledge nor the power needed to produce them.

§ III. The Serious Religious, Mental, Moral and Physical Dangers of Spiritism

275. Among the wise maxims taught mankind by their divine Master, Jesus Christ, is that which enables them to distinguish at once truth from error, right from wrong, and good from evil. It is the Gospel test: "*By their fruits you shall know them.*" (Matt. 7, 16.) We have the best possible authorities for resorting on occasion to this unerring principle, viz.: the dictate of reason, the unanimous consent of men, and the living voice of God's incarnate Son. By applying this infallible rule to the system of Spiritism and its agents we shall be able to know what we should think of them, and to determine what ought to be our attitude in their regard.

There are three most precious gifts placed by the beneficent Creator within the possession and reach of man. First, his just and correct relation to his Sovereign Maker and Lord through the knowledge and practice of religious, Christian Faith. Second, the normal condition and operation of his mental faculties, intellect and free will, through which he can attend to and reach the end of his earthly existence, his heavenly appointed destiny, the fulfillment of God's holy will

in this world, and the attainment of eternal happiness in the next. Third, the healthly, faultless state of his moral conduct.

Here we pertinently ask: What is the influence of spiritistic communications on the three above-mentioned gifts? God's authority, the verdict of reason and the sad lesson of experience compel us to say that it is fatal in the extreme to them all. In fact, Spiritism perverts in the individual experimenters and the mediums the teachings of the Christian Faith; it is a menace to the mental faculties, whose untrammelled exercise is needed to work out and secure our eternal salvation; it is utterly destructive of man's moral life.

1. What do the advocates of Spiritism teach us concerning Christianity and its Founder? Let the Spiritists tell it themselves.

Sir Oliver Lodge: "The traditional teaching of Christianity will have to undergo a radical transformation."

Dr. Conan Doyle: "Christianity as a moral system I hold to be as pernicious as it is absurd."

Stainton Moses: "Christ was a mere man. Through the revelation of the spirits we have lost a God-man; but we have gained a model man, all but divine."

Allan Kardec: "The third revelation of the Son of God is that announced by the spirits who are the mouthpiece of heaven."

As shown in other spiritistic works, scarcely a truth of the Christian religion remains intact, for they reject the Fall of man, the fact of Redemption, Christ's miracles, His Resurrection, the Sacraments of the Church, the doctrine of Eternal Reward to the just and Everlasting Punishment to the wicked, the inspiration of the Bible and other fundamental truths too numerous to mention.

S. George Stock: "Christianity has spent its force, and Spiritism, another revelation, has succeeded it, a revelation suited to the needs of the time."

It would be a huge mistake to believe that the new religion, intended to supplant Christianity, root and branch, forms a consistent, coherent, harmonious system of doctrines, for noth-

ing is farther from the truth. All is contradiction, chaos and confusion. It is often found that what one spirit emphatically asserts, another just as emphatically denies. Nothing better could be expected from the inmates of the infernal region, where, as the prophet Job (10, 22) tells us, "*No order but everlasting horror dwelleth.*" There is, however, one point on which they all agree, their hatred of Christian truth.

After quoting the startling views of Spiritists on Christianity and its Founder, shall we undertake the task of confuting them? No, by no means, and this for two weighty reasons. First, because they are only copying from old and modern unbelievers or infidels assertions and assumptions refuted by both Catholic and Protestant apologists hundreds of times, as shown by the controversial works that fill the libraries of the civilized world. Second, because no one can be reasonably expected to answer charges unsupported by any proof. The *ipse dixit* of Sir Oliver Lodge and Dr. Conan Doyle, though they both hail from proud Albion, produces no conviction on the mind of the truth-seeking American people. When the Spiritists will offer us better credentials than the contradictory doctrines of their teachers, it will be time enough for us to submit them to a searching examination so as to ascertain what they are worth.

Speaking at the beginning of this article of the destructive character of the spiritistic religion, I said that it is calculated to pervert the principles of the Christian Faith in individuals. This is unhappily true of those who, in defiance of God's explicit prohibition, indulge in practices forbidden under the severest penalties. But as to historic Christianity, which, I maintain, is identical with Catholicism, the newfangled revelation of the Spiritists can no more affect it than it can efface the sun from the heavens. This is the Christianity that has stood the test of the wise Jewish sage, Gamaliel, who, nineteen hundred years ago, in Jerusalem defended the Apostles arrayed before the Council, when they were threatened with death for preaching the Christian Faith, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He spoke thus to the assembled judges: "*I say to you, refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this*

work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it." (Acts 5, 38–39.)

Now, after the lapse of nearly twenty centuries which witnessed its unceasing combats and its perpetual victories, we may complete the argument and say: That work, the Christian religion, has not been overthrown, therefore it is the work of God. Applying the same test to the spiritistic cult we do not hesitate to predict its downfall; it shall sooner or later come to nought, for it is the work not of God, but of Satan. This new revelation ushered in by spirit messages through the entranced mediums is a gigantic delusion, a huge fraud imposed upon a world which has become estranged from Christ, and has lapsed into a new form of paganism.

2. Another evil fruit of Spiritism. The mental dangers attending spiritistic practices are recognized by men well qualified to speak with authority on the present subject. Dr. L. S. Forbes Winslow in his work on "Spiritualistic Madness" (1877) writes as follows:

"Thousands of unfortunate people are at present confined in lunatic asylums on account of having tampered with the supernatural." And quoting an American journal he goes on to say: "Not a week passes, in which we do not hear that some of these unfortunates destroy themselves by suicide, or are removed to a lunatic asylum. The mediums often manifest signs of an abnormal condition of their mental faculties, and among certain of them are found unequivocal indications of a true demoniacal possession. The evil spreads rapidly and it will produce in a few years frightful results."

But as all Christians must admit, by far the greatest danger to which spiritistic practitioners expose themselves is that of incurring the eternal loss of their soul. For if insanity overtakes them when guilty of some grievous offense deserving endless punishment, and they were to depart from this life before recovering the normal use of reason, whose exercise is absolutely necessary for acts of worthy repentance, their doom is sealed.

Among the other evil effects attributed to spiritistic performances the following have been found to occur, particu-

larly in the case of mediums: shattering of the bodily constitution, the impairing of the mental faculties, ever growing propensity to unlawful acts, paralyzing the energy of the will, whose power is gradually weakened and is finally surrendered to the control of invisible agencies. Persistent temptations to suicide on the plea of joining the happy spirits in the great beyond, are also noted. Here again we conclude: if a tree is known by its fruit, what should we think of a system and of practices leading to such fatal consequences as are pointed out in hundreds of volumes on this subject and are summarized in the present article?

3. Immorality is another pernicious evil traceable to spiritistic doing. Dr. B. F. Hatch, an eminent American physician, former husband of the late Mrs. Cora V. Hatch, a once famous medium operating in several cities of the United States, writes: "The extensive opportunities which I have had of studying the nature and results of Spiritism justify me, I think, in laying just claim to being a competent witness on the matter in question. I have known many whose integrity of character rendered them worthy examples to all around, but who on becoming mediums and giving up their individuality, that is the control of their will, also gave up every sense of honor and decency. There are thousands of high-minded spiritists who will agree with me that it is no slander to say that the inculcation of no doctrine has ever shown such disastrous moral results as the practice of Spiritism. I stand appalled before the revelation of its awful realities. In my inquiries I have been able to count up over 70 mediums, most of whom have abandoned their conjugal relations."

276. To prove once more that the invisible, free and intellectual agencies at work in the spiritistic *séances* are not the souls of the departed, but the wicked, fallen angels, the demons, I call the reader's attention to the following remarks: Can we reasonably suppose that the spirits of the dead, once our dear companions in life, take delight in deceiving the living? Is it conceivable that the souls of the departed, our dear relatives and friends, would expose their surviving par-

ents, their brothers and sisters to the irreligious, immoral and physical dangers described above?

Among the natural cravings of the human heart is the desire to know something certain about the unseen world. As Cardinal Gibbons well remarks: "The only serene questioning about the thrilling existence of the hereafter is that of the man whose Faith is sure, whose grasp of divine revelation is firm and steady. There is no barrier between him and his God, no wall of mystery and uncertainty about his dear and noble dead." The Communion of Saints has always been an essential part of the Catholic Creed from the very dawn of Christianity. The Church firmly believes in the possibility of communication with the departed that have died in the Lord, whether they be already basking in the light of the beatific vision, or still detained in the purifying region of Purgatory. But such communing and interchange of spiritual benefits is carried on by the Faithful in a manner utterly at variance with the dangerous and often fatal methods of Spiritism.

Hence desire for knowledge concerning the departed and of the secrets of the great beyond does not at all disturb the earnest, devout Christian, who knows with certainty that his Faith contains God's own revelation regarding the future life and the immortality of his soul. But alas! the unhappy multitude that are destitute of the blessed, cheering hope founded on the religion of Jesus Christ, yearn for knowledge of the next world, for some means of bridging over the chasm that yawns between the living and the dead. They foolishly imagine that a satisfactory answer to their cravings is given by spiritism. Poor creatures. They are the victims of a huge illusion, the sports of lying devils. They ask for the bread of truth, and they receive the stone of error. Our earnest prayer is that they may look elsewhere for reliable instruction and genuine consolation, that before it is too late they may thus escape the fatal dangers of those of whom St. Paul spoke in his first letter to Timothy (I, 4, 1): *"Some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils."*

CHAPTER V

THEOSOPHY

§ I. Its Meaning and Program

277. Theosophy is a Greek term consisting of two words meaning wisdom concerning God. The advocates of this modern mental aberration have chosen a very ambitious title, eminently adapted to deceive the unsophisticated and propagate pernicious doctrines under the disguise of a high-sounding name. The United States enjoys the unenviable reputation of being the seat of its first establishment by the Russian adventuress, Helen Petrovna Blavatsky, who, jointly with Col. H. S. Olcott, organized the first Theosophical Society in the city of New York in the year 1875. Its purpose may be thus briefly stated:

(1) To form a nucleus of the universal Brotherhood of Humanity, of members gathered from every nation without distinction of race, color, caste, creed or sex.

(2) To promote the study of comparative religion, of science and philosophy.

(3) To investigate the hitherto unexplained, hidden laws of nature and of the powers latent in man. Moreover, said Society excludes the profession of any particular religion, and does not exact from its members adhesion to any special creed, or form of belief. Hence its endorsement of the capital error, religious indifferentism, as it opens its door to adherents of any Christian denomination, Catholics included, along with Jews, Mahometans, Pagans, Atheists and Agnostics.

What is to be the unavoidable result of an alliance with such an esoteric brotherhood of a multitude of believers and unbelievers, the intelligent reader can judge for himself. As seen in the sequel, the Theosophic system, if it deserves the name, bristles with absurdities in religion, philosophy, and

other matters too numerous to mention. Destitute, as it is, of any competent authority, it can impose no bound or restriction on its disciples, who, by freely indulging their fertile brains, give utterance to contradictory views, thus bringing Theosophy into ridicule and well-merited contempt. There is, however, something good in this feature, for it greatly facilitates its refutation. Man's general common sense can easily do it.

§ II. Some of Its Glaring Errors

278. Theosophy's first dogma abolishes a personal God, who is unknown and unknowable, who is said to have nothing to do with this world and its inhabitants; the denial of another Christian truth, God's providence over His creatures. We need not then be surprised, if, in all the vast literature of Theosophists, there is not one page devoted to man's duty to God, the god of Theosophy being man himself, who is said to possess a divine nature. We are then quite justified in subscribing to the verdict of Rev. Giov. Busnelli, S.J., who concludes the four learned volumes of his study on this subject thus: "Theosophy not only is not a religion, but is the science and system of irreligion: as a philosophy, it is irrational dogmatism and an illusion." According to the teaching of Theosophy man is free from any accountability to any superior, invisible judge and he is the independent master of his own destiny, having the future entirely under his own control. Instead then of providing incentives to virtue and deterrents from vice, it does away with them and thereby sanctions utter recklessness of conduct. Consistently with this view, rewards and punishments have no place in this system. The good, by the so-called inexorable law of Karma, of cause and effect, attain the happiness which they have worked out for themselves, viz., final absorption into the infinite entity from which their soul emanated as a constituent, integral part, having thus reached the Nirvana, its ultimate perfection, a form of pantheism pure and simple. The wicked, through the working of the same law, end in a highly desired annihilation.

Now this is exactly the ardent wish of the reprobates in hell, which, as Holy Scripture assures us, shall never be realized, for, as we read in the Apocalypse (9, 6): *"And in those days men shall seek death, and shall not find it; and they shall desire to die, and death shall fly from them."*

§ III. Illusive Promises of Theosophy

279. We are gravely told that no man in becoming a Theosophist need cease to be a Christian: on the contrary, he will acquire a deeper insight into his own Faith, a firmer hold on its truth, and a broader understanding of its sacred teachings We are also informed of the Theosophic principle that each religion is best for those who are born in it. Hence in the mind of Theosophists, a Japanese should continue to be a Shintoist; the Chinese a Confucianist; the Hindoo a Buddhist; the Moslem a believer in Mahomet, and the Hottentot of Africa a worshipper of his fetish idols. Consequently all missionary enterprises should be abolished as uncalled for, and Jesus Christ should never have commissioned His Apostles and their successors to evangelize and convert the nations to His Gospel.

It is highly important for all Christians, of whatever denomination, to know what Madame Blavatsky, a veritable Bolshevik in religion, held, taught, and wrote on Christianity: "Christianity and Catholicism, with its fetish worship, is far worse and more pernicious than Induism in its most idolatrous aspects." (Isis Unveiled.) "The Theosophical Society is in exact opposition to all positive religions, and especially to Christianity, which it considers most pernicious." (*Masonic World,* January, 1880.)

§ IV. Theosophic Theory on Man's Future Destiny

According to Theosophy, death is the passage from this state of life to another, when the soul goes through various reincarnations, assuming other bodies as a process of continuous purification, with the certainty that every human soul will

finally attain its highest perfection called the Absolute. Here is a specimen of Theosophy's boldest assumption sustained by no proof. If there is such a provision on the part of God, on whom alone man's destiny here and hereafter depends, He must have announced it in His revelation. Now this is the undeniable fact, from Genesis to the Apocalypse we do not find the remotest indication of such a provision on God's part. There we find, on the contrary, what the Catholic Church teaches concerning the three states to be allotted to human souls as they appear at the Judgment Seat, namely, either eternal Heaven, a temporary Purgatory, or everlasting Hell, according to each one's deserts. The Theosophic theory stated above evidently implies new trials and probations in the next world for such as have failed in this; a huge illusion, which the reader will find refuted in the preceding chapter on Spiritism, as such is the error also held by the Spiritists in common with the Theosophists. Men can no more change the divine decrees on their future destiny than they can blot out the sun from the firmament (n. 274, p. 373).

§ V. Theosophy Versus Catholic Dogmas

280. But there is for us Catholics one argument against Theosophy which alone suffices to condemn it as a theory flagrantly opposed to the principal dogmatic truths of our Faith. Father Busnelli, referred to above, draws up a contrast between several articles of our Faith and the tenets held by Theosophists, with the result, patent to all, that there exists between them an irreconcilable opposition.

The following are the Catholic dogmas openly contravened, denied and rejected by Theosophists: (a) The Unity of God, Trinity of Persons, and the Divine Attributes. (b) The Divinity of Christ, and the truth of His miracles as credentials of His heavenly mission. (c) The doctrine of the Sacraments, which Theosophy mutilates, perverts, or denies altogether. (d) The Divine Origin and Infallibility of the Catholic Church.

If this evident conflict between the truths of our holy

religion and the vagaries of Theosophy will not suffice to deter our Catholic people from joining its ranks, nothing else can do it.

§ VI. Marvels of Theosophy as Its Credentials

280. Attested, as they are, by unimpeachable witnesses, many of its wondrous facts cannot be denied. The main point to be ascertained is what are the agents producing them? Among its feats the following are adduced as specimens and examples. Instantaneous passing from a very remote place to another, as distance is no barrier to their activity: bringing objects from one end of the earth to the other with the rapidity which Christianity attributes to the angels: making themselves visible to some privileged persons, while remaining invisible to all around: detecting with accuracy hidden things, wherever they may have been concealed. Music is heard played by invisible hands, but instead of its being the work of spirits floating in the air, it is but a proof of the marvellous skill of the occult Brotherhood, whose superior knowledge of nature's laws makes it easy for them to produce the vibrations which cause such bewitching harmony, though all musical instruments are far away. Similar wonders are claimed by the Spiritists, who attribute them to the souls of the dead. Here, on the contrary, they are ascribed to the extraordinary skill of some of the mysterious Brotherhood, of the Mahatmas, of the adept who is projecting his astral body, whatever that may be, in a moment by a mere act of his will from the recesses of far-off Thibet, or from distant India to a New York or San Francisco drawing-room. Such astounding phenomena are simply, they tell us, the result of the application of natural laws by the most proficient Theosophists, who have acquired by long, earnest study an insight into them. What is the purpose the Theosophists have in view in displaying such performances? They tell it themselves—it is to strip all the miracles of Christianity of their value as proofs of divine intervention. It is to show that those powers, which the ignorant vulgar (that is, benighted

Christians and Catholics) regard as supernatural and miraculous, are but an employment of some natural agencies by the advanced Theosophists, who have acquired an insight into them such as is not possessed by the most proficient scientific investigators of our times. The astounding prodigies of the Theosophists are presented to the world as their credentials. To judge of the value of such credentials we must see who are the real agents to whom they must be traced. It is easy to see the striking affinity between Spiritism and Theosophy. Hence all the strictures which, in the preceding chapter, we wrote of the former, are rightly applied to the latter. We accordingly arrive at the logical conclusion that, if spiritistic phenomena are attributed to preternatural agents opposed to God, to Christianity, and to truth, throwing dust in the eyes of men, we have all the more reasons for assigning Theosophy to the same origin, and for tracing it to the same preternatural agents, Satan and his associate rebel angels.

Turning from Spiritists to Theosophists we find the latter even bolder in their work of destruction. In accounting for their extraordinary deeds we utterly reject the explanation they themselves give, as being based on the assumption of powers entirely beyond their capacity and control. To put the matter in plain English, Theosophy is a false, antichristion godless system, teaching doctrines subversive of all belief and all true morality, and putting forward as its credentials wonders which are neither more nor less than simple deviltry. To sum up. The wonders of Theosophy cannot be supernatural, for the system to which they bear witness is one that blasphemes alike Almighty God and His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. We therefore cannot avoid the inference that they are due to the preternatural powers of the invisible enemies of God and of man. It is nothing else than a diabolical scheme hiding its true character behind the veil of a universal Brotherhood and the pretense of a superior knowledge of nature's secret laws. It deserves the hatred and abhorrence not only of everyone who calls himself a Christian, but also of every believer in a personal God. There is, however, one class of people that must feel grateful to the

adepts in Theosophy. They are the infidel scientists, the militant rationalists who discard the miracles of the Gospel on the plea that they are simply the result of the hidden forces and laws of nature, the very laws and forces lately discovered by the enlightened Theosophic Brotherhood, the Mahatmas of far-off India and Thibet. *Credat judæus Apella*—tell that to the Marines! (Horace.) (n. 274.)

Though the Catholic Church, preserved in its vitality by the almighty power of her Founder, Jesus Christ, cannot and shall not fail, yet her individual members, infected by the insidious poison of Theosophy, may fall away from the truth and apostatize from the Church of their Baptism. It is invariably noticed that all who subject themselves to its influence begin by abandoning every religious practice and end by denying Catholicism itself. They thus give the lie to the assurance that a man may be at the same time a true Theosophist and a loyal Catholic. As Holy Scripture tells us (Wis. 2, 23–25), the first sin committed on earth was caused by the gross deception practiced on Mother Eve by Satan, the father of lies. We earnestly hope that the perusal of these pages will convince our readers of the fact that whilst Theosophy, when well understood, furnishes no rational ground for its acceptance, it supplies, on the contrary, many forcible reasons for its rejection. The vigilant eye of the Catholic Church could not overlook that new danger to the Faith and morality of her subjects. Hence we are not surprised at the condemnation of Theosophy by the following decree:

"On Wednesday, July 16, 1919, the following question was submitted to the Congregation of the Holy Office of the Inquisition: Whether the doctrines, which are at present called Theosophical, can be reconciled with the Catholic doctrines; and, consequently, whether it is lawful to join Theosophical societies, to attend their meetings, and to read their books, newspapers, journals and writings. The Congregation answered negatively to all preceding questions." Dated from Rome, July 18, 1919.

The list of authors appended at the end of this Part IX gives the documents on which the present chapter is based.

CHAPTER VI

MODERNISM

§ I. Its Definition

281. If Modernism is to be discussed, it should first of all be defined, for every one is aware of the confusions which arise from lack of definition. There are subjects which readily lend themselves to definition, and subjects which do not. Modernism is of the latter kind, for it is not at all an easy thing to define what Modernism is. The difficulty lies in the fact that whilst truth is one and consistent, error is manifold and evasive. Being absolutely destitute of competent authority to safeguard its principles, whatever they be, Modernism as defined by one of its individual adherents may, with equal right, be rejected by another. In fact Modernism cannot be found as a complete system in any work of any one Modernist. It is to the Encyclical of Pius X (September 8, 1907) that we must look for the statement and presentation gathered from the many writings of the Modernists themselves, in which here one doctrine, there another is contained. It is one of their cleverest devices, says the Encyclical, to present their doctrines without order and systematic arrangement in a scattered and disjointed manner, so as to make it appear as if their minds were in doubt or hesitation, whereas in reality they are quite fixed and steadfast. As it will be shown in the sequel, the Sovereign Pontiff was fully justified in defining Modernism as the synthesis of all heresies. In fact, as we learn from Church History, other heresies have attacked this or that particular article of the Christian Faith, such as the Divinity of Christ, His Virgin Birth, the Real Presence, etc., while Modernism, like the Reformers of the sixteenth century, strikes at faith and auhority itself. The root principle of this error consists essentially in affirming that the religious soul must draw from itself the objects and

motives of its faith, and realize the existence of God, not from the traditional philosophical and theological demonstration, but from the inner conscience and craving after the divine. It rejects all supernatural revelation imposed upon the conscience, and thus, as a necessary consequence, Modernism becomes the negation of the doctrinal authority of the Church established by Jesus Christ. Such a system is nothing less than the critical application of skepticism to the whole of human knowledge: it not only issues in a denial of revealed religion, but in the destruction of all certainty in knowledge of whatsoever kind.

§ II. The Modernists' Program

282. This can be gathered from their tendencies and particularly from their ambitious plan of reform reduced to the following chief heads.

(1) A spirit of complete emancipation directed to misrepresent and weaken ecclesiastical authority.

(2) The emancipation of science from the fear of conflict with the Church, so as to enable the former to traverse freely and untrammelled every field of investigation.

(3) The emancipation of the State from ecclesiastical interference directed to hamper social activities.

(4) The emancipation of the private conscience whose inspirations must not be overridden by papal definitions or anathemas.

Such is substantially the Modernists' Program, which, while it countenances and flatters individual independence, cannot but meet with the full approval of ultra-liberal scientists, as well as of all upholders of Cæsarism and Febronianism, errors proscribed by the Church.

Modernism fails completely in its attempt at religious reform, for it cannot accomplish it without tampering with the true Catholic concept of dogma, and no more pernicious error can there be than that which alters dogma in its very root and essence. Their system, pushed to its logical conclusion, means the destruction of all religion, the very aim of

rationalists of whom the Pontiff says in his Encyclical *Pascendi:* "The rationalists are not wanting in their applause, and the most frank and sincere amongst them congratulate themselves on having found in the Modernists the most valuable of all allies."

It is plain that silence or mere connivance at the Modernists' doctrines on the part of the teaching body of the Catholic Church would inevitably destroy every vestige of what is her essential character as the world itself has ever known her, and reduce her to the level and likeness of Protestant sects. It was, therefore, obviously imperative on the head of the Church that he should oppose with all his might the infiltration of such ideas in the midst of those who look to him for guidance and guardianship in all that pertains to the salvation of their immortal souls.

§ III. Modernism Built on False Philosophy

282. Pius X in his Encyclical distinctly says that "the whole Modernistic system, containing as it does errors so many and so great, has been born of the union between faith and false philosophy." He evidently refers to Agnosticism, the rationalistic philosophy borrowed from Kant. Kant's influence is easily discernible in Modernism. Though a rationalist he does not deny the supernatural, but he puts it outside the field of knowledge, and makes religion not the result of intellectual conviction of its truth, but as a matter of inward, personal experience, independent of any external authority. According to this teaching, as we read in the quoted Encyclical, human reason is confined entirely within the field of phenomena, that is to say, to the senses, and in the manner in which they are perceptible; it has no right and no power to transgress these limits. Hence it is incapable of lifting itself up to God, and of recognizing His existence even by means of visible things. Given these premises, all will readily perceive what becomes of natural theology, of the motives of credibility, miracles and prophecies and of external revelation, the denial of which constitutes palpable errors proscribed by

the Vatican Council in the chapter on revelation: "If any one says that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason by means of the things that are made, let him be anathema"; and also, "If any one says that it is not possible or not expedient that man be taught through the medium of divine revelation about God and the worship to be paid Him, let him be anathema"; finally: "If any one says that divine revelation cannot be made credible by external signs, and that therefore men should be drawn to the Faith only by their personal internal experience, or by private inspiration, let him be anathema." (*De Fide, cap.* 3.) The Catholic Church is far-seeing in watching with vigilance the development not only of theological, but also of philosophical opinions. Philosophy, after all, is only the pursuit of the principles of knowledge, and the reason's guide in the attainment of truth. If the first principles are unsound, the whole field of knowledge sacred and profane is rendered insecure, not for the philosopher only, but also for the man in the street.

Behold here an additional reason bidding us look for guidance in our studies to the indefectible voice of Peter, which once more resounds through the world, and saves those who will listen to it from wasting their intellectual energies in speculations that lead far from the truth.

In the years 1907 and 1910 were issued as many as fifteen official documents under the (alas!) brief Pontificate of Pius X all bearing on Modernism. These acts are for the most part of a disciplinary character. But the Decree *Lamentabili* of July 3, 1907, condemning 65 distinct propositions, is entirely doctrinal. The Encyclical *Pascendi* of Sept. 8, 1907, and the Motu Proprio of March 18, 1907, are both doctrinal and disciplinary in character. Father A. Vermeersch, S.J., professor of moral theology in the Gregorian University of Rome, writer of the article on Modernism in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," is of the opinion that the two principal documents, the Decree *Lamentabili* and the Encyclical *Pascendi* contain in their doctrinal conclusions the infallible teaching of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, to which

judgment we cheerfully subscribe. The Decree *Lamentabili* has been called the new Syllabus, because it contains the proscription by the Holy Office of 65 propositions, all taken from the writings of Modernists.

We transcribe them at the end of this chapter as a standing, eloquent vindication of the right and wisdom of Pius X in his condemnation of Modernism.

In this connection we deem it opportune briefly to refer to another Syllabus, that published by Pius IX on December 8, 1869. In its 80 condemned propositions the Supreme Pontiff condemns the leading errors of our times, namely:

(*a*) Pantheism and Absolute Rationalism.

(*b*) Moderate Rationalism.

(*c*) Communism, Secret and other Unlawful Societies.

(*d*) Capital errors on the Constitution of the Church and her Rights.

(*e*) False notions on Christian Marriage.

(*f*) Errors on Civil Society and its Relations to the Church.

(*g*) Erroneous Views on the Temporal Power of the Roman Pontiff.

(*h*) Errors springing from the False Liberalism of our Times. (Denzinger, "Enchiridion," pp. 465–473.)

As to the theological *nota* or character of this pontifical document, Catholics generally endorse the judgment of the writer in *The Dublin Review* for January, 1888, who in a well reasoned-out article on *Doctrinal Apostolic Letters,* pp. 84–130, comes to the conclusion that the Syllabus in question furnishes an infallible rule of belief. As a matter of fact, the document was sent to all Catholic bishops by the Pope's command for the express purpose of serving as a guide to their teaching. We never understood how the Universal Teacher could possibly so act without guaranteeing the truth of what was thus authoritatively addressed.

§ IV. Why Modernism Has Been Condemned

283. In view of what has already been said it would hardly appear necessary to allude further to the reasons that have

necessitated the condemnation of Modernism. Nevertheless, for the sake of clearness, we may again set down briefly the principal ones.

"1. 'Modernism,' by doing away with the rational foundations of all religious faith, destroys the possibility of all religion, natural or revealed.

"2. It denies the fact of external revelation—i.e., that God has spoken or communicated truth to man, in the form of a truth-message from without.

"3. It makes of what was formerly reckoned to be the truth taught by God no more than the speculative description of feelings experienced by men.

"4. It, consequently, rejects the Bible as a collection of documents having any historical value when they relate supernatural or miraculous events.

"5. It teaches that Christ, as a historic personage, was a man and not God; that the Godhead in Him was recognised by 'faith' as akin to itself; that He was not always aware of the fact that He was God, even by the experiences of His religious sense; that He was ignorant of His mediatorial character.

"6. It refuses permanence to the dogmas of faith, as not coming from God, but from men: it interprets those dogmas as the expressions of mere subjective experience, in the light of further subjective experience.

"7. It recognises no Church founded by Christ Himself in person: but one grown up by force of circumstances to band together a number of individuals possessing in common similar religious experiences.

"8. It, as a consequence, subverts the constitution of the Church, teaching that authority comes from below and not from above, from the people who compose it, and not from God.

"9. It rejects the doctrine that the Sacraments (as instruments conveying grace) were instituted by Christ personally.

"10. It is based upon a philosophical theory of Sensationalism or Scepticism (Agnosticism), that is subversive of all knowledge of ultimate reality, natural or divine: and it takes

refuge in a Pragmatism to cover its non-rational character.

"And all these points, selected as the most striking out of many, are in direct opposition to the teaching of Christianity. For this reason, and on these considerations, there was no other possible course open to the Catholic Church as the guardian of revelation and custodian of a divine trust, than to condemn it officially. Already reprobated by the consciences of the faithful, the tendencies, teachings, and logical conclusions of 'Modernism' were included in the sixty-five condemned propositions of the Decree *Lamentabili sane* (3rd July, 1907); and again, presented in the form of a definite and related system in the Encyclical *Pascendi Gregis* (8th September, 1907), the whole 'Modernist' heresy was finally anathematised." (From "Modernism," by C. S. B.)

As a fitting conclusion of our subject we here reproduce some appropriate remarks of Rev. J. M. Bampton, S.J., at the end of his course of Lectures on Modernism.

"Pius X in his famous Encyclical *Pascendi* condemned the whole system of Modernism, root and branch. As was to be expected, both the Pope himself and his measures were severally criticised in certain quarters. He was represented as the very type of a reactionary and obscurantist Roman Pontiff, eager to repress by violent means every indication within the Church of originality of thought and independence of judgment. What the Holy Father did was to tear away the mask from Modernism and expose it to the world in its true colors as subversive of the Christian Faith. The Church possessed in Pius X a Pope who understood his office and was fully conscious of its solemn duties and responsibilities. We may thank God that whenever the need arises, and Christian Truth is called in question, above the confused babble of conflicting tongues there rings out loud and clear, proclaiming truth and refuting error, the voice of the successor of him to whom Christ gave the charge of the sheep and lambs of His flock, for whom Christ prayed that his faith might not fail, whom Christ appointed to confirm the brethren. Pius X will go down to history distinguished among the illustrious

line of Roman Pontiffs for his vigilance in watching over the deposit of the Faith entrusted to his keeping and for his superb courage in defending it."

SYLLABUS OF ERRORS CONDEMNED BY THE S. CONGR. OF THE INQUISITION, JULY 3, 1907

With truly lamentable results, our age, intolerant of all check in its investigations of the ultimate causes of things, not unfrequently follows what is new in such a way as to reject the legacy, as it were, of the human race, and thus fall into the most grievous errors. These errors will be all the more pernicious when they affect sacred disciplines, the interpretation of the Sacred Scripture, the principal mysteries of the Faith. It is to be greatly deplored that among Catholics also not a few writers are to be found who, crossing the boundaries fixed by the Fathers and by the Church herself, seek out, on the plea of higher intelligence and in the name of historical considerations, that progress of dogmas which is in reality the corruption of the same.

But lest errors of this kind, which are being daily spread among the Faithful, should strike root in their minds and corrupt the purity of the Faith, it has pleased His Holiness Pius X, by divine providence Pope, that the chief among them should be noted and condemned through the office of this Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition.

Wherefore, after a most diligent investigation, and after having taken the opinion of the Reverend Consultors, the Most Eminent and Reverend Lords Cardinals, the general inquisitors in matters of faith and morals, decided that *the following propositions are to be condemned and proscribed, as they are, by this general Decree, condemned and proscribed:*

1. The ecclesiastical law which prescribes that books regarding the divine Scriptures are subject to previous censorship does not extend to critical scholars or students of the scientific exegesis of the Old and New Testaments.

2. The Church's interpretation of the Sacred Books is not

indeed to be condemned, but it is subject to the more accurate judgment and to the correction of the exegetes.

3. From the ecclesiastical judgments and censures passed against free and more scientific (*cultiorem*) exegesis, it may be gathered that the Faith proposed by the Church contradicts history and that the Catholic dogmas cannot be reconciled with the true origins of the Christian religion.

4. The *magisterium* of the Church cannot, even through dogmatic definitions, determine the genuine sense of the Sacred Scriptures.

5. Since in the deposit of the Faith only revealed truths are contained, under no respect does it appertain to the Church to pass judgment concerning the assertions of human sciences.

6. In defining truths the Church learning (*discens*) and the Church teaching (*docens*) collaborate in such a way that it only remains for the Church *docens* to sanction the opinions of the Church *discens*.

7. The Church, when it proscribes errors, cannot exact from the Faithful any internal assent by which the judgments issued by it are accepted.

8. Those who treat as of no weight the condemnations passed by the Sacred Congregations of the Index or by the other Roman Congregations are free from all blame.

9. Those who believe that God is really the author of the Sacred Scripture display excessive simplicity or ignorance.

10. The inspiration of the books of the Old Testament consists in the fact that the Israelite writers have handed down religious doctrines under a peculiar aspect, either little or not at all known to the Gentiles.

11. Divine inspiration is not to be so extended to the whole of Sacred Scripture that it renders its parts, all and single, immune from all error.

12. The exegete, if he wishes to apply himself usefully to biblical studies, must first of all put aside all preconceived opinions concerning the supernatural origin of the Sacred Scripture, and interpret it not otherwise than other merely human documents.

13. The Evangelists themselves and the Christians of the second and third generation arranged (*digesserunt*) artificially the evangelical parables, and in this way gave an explanation of the scanty fruit of the preaching of Christ among the Jews.

14. In a great many narrations the Evangelists reported not so much things that are true as things which even though false they judged to be more profitable for their readers.

15. The Gospels until the time the canon was defined and constituted were increased by additions and corrections; hence in them there remained of the doctrine of Christ only a faint and uncertain trace.

16. The narrations of John are not properly history, but the mystical contemplation of the Gospel; the discourses contained in his Gospel are theological meditations, devoid of historical truth concerning the mystery of salvation.

17. The Fourth Gospel exaggerated miracles not only that the wonderful might stand out but also that they might become more suitable for signifying the work and the glory of the Word Incarnate.

18. John claims for himself the quality of a witness concerning Christ; but in reality he is only a distinguished witness of the Christian life, or of the life of Christ in the Church at the close of the first century.

19. Heterodox exegetes have expressed the true sense of the Scriptures more faithfully than Catholic exegetes.

20. Revelation could be nothing but the consciousness acquired by man of his relation with God.

21. Revelation, constituting the object of Catholic faith, was not completed with the Apostles.

22. The dogmas, which the Church gives out as revealed, are not truths which have fallen down from heaven, but are an interpretation of religious facts, which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort.

23. Opposition may and actually does exist between the facts which are narrated in Scripture and the dogmas of the Church which rest on them; so that the critic may reject as false facts which the Church holds as most certain.

24. The exegete is not to be blamed for constructing premises from which it follows that the dogmas are historically false or doubtful, provided he does not directly deny the dogmas themselves.

25. The assent of faith rests ultimately on a mass of probabilities.

26. The dogmas of faith are to be held only according to their practical sense, that is, as preceptive norms of conduct, but not as norms of believing.

27. The divinity of Jesus Christ is not proved from the Gospels; but is a dogma which the Christian conscience has derived from the notion of the Messias.

28. Jesus, while He was exercising His ministry, did not speak with the object of teaching that He was the Messias, nor did His miracles tend to prove this.

29. It is lawful to believe that the Christ of history is far inferior to the Christ who is the object of faith.

30. In all the evangelical texts the name *Son of God* is equivalent only to Messias, and does not at all signify that Christ is the true and natural Son of God.

31. The doctrine concerning Christ taught by Paul, John, the Councils of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon, is not that which Jesus taught, but that which the Christian conscience conceived concerning Jesus.

32. It is not possible to reconcile the natural sense of the Gospel texts with the sense taught by our theologians concerning the conscience and the infallible knowledge of Jesus Christ.

33. It is evident to everybody who is not led by preconceived opinions, that either Jesus professed an error concerning the immediate Messianic coming, or that the greater part of His doctrine as contained in the Gospels is destitute of authenticity.

34. The critic cannot ascribe to Christ a knowledge uncircumscribed by limits except on an hypothesis which cannot be historically conceived and which is repugnant to the moral sense, viz., that Christ as man had the knowledge of God and

yet was unwilling to communicate the knowledge of a great many things to His disiples and to posterity.

35. Christ had not always the consciousness of His Messianic dignity.

36. The Resurrection of the Savior is not properly a fact of the historical order, but a fact of merely supernatural order, neither demonstrated nor demonstrable, which the Christian conscience gradually derived from other facts.

37. Faith in the Resurrection of Christ was in the beginning not so much in the fact itself of the Resurrection, as in the immortal life of Christ with God.

38. The doctrine of the expiatory death of Christ is not evangelical but Pauline.

39. The opinions concerning the origin of the Sacraments, with which the Fathers of Trent were imbued and which certainly influenced their dogmatic canons, are very different from those which now rightly obtain among historians who examine into Christianity.

40. The Sacraments had their origin in the fact that the Apostles and their successors, swayed and moved by circumstances and events, interpreted some idea or intention of Christ.

41. The Sacraments are merely intended to bring before the mind of man the ever-beneficent presence of the Creator.

42. The Christian community imposed (*induxit*) the necessity of Baptism, adopting it as a necessary rite, and adding to it the obligations of the Christian profession.

43. The practice of conferring Baptism on infants was a disciplinary evolution, which became one of the causes why the Sacrament was divided into two, viz.: Baptism and Penance.

44. There is nothing to prove that the rite of the Sacrament of Confirmation was employed by the Apostles: but the formal distinction of the two Sacraments, Baptism and Confirmation does not belong to the history of primitive Christianity.

45. Not everything which Paul narrates concerning the

institution of the Eucharist (I Cor. 11, 23–25) is to be taken historically.

46. In the primitive Church the conception of the Christian sinner reconciled by the authority of the Church did not exist, but it was only very slowly that the Church accustomed itself to this conception. Nay, even after Penance was recognized as an institution of the Church, it was not called a Sacrament, for it would be held as an ignominious Sacrament.

47. The words of the Lord: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained* (John 20, 22, 23), do not at all refer to the Sacrament of Penance, whatever the Fathers of Trent may have been pleased to say.

48. James in his Epistle (5, 14–15) did not intend to promulgate a Sacrament of Christ, but to commend a pious custom, and if in this custom he happens to distinguish (*cernit*) a means of grace, it is not in that rigorous manner in which it was received by the theologians who laid down the notion and the number of the Sacraments.

49. The Christian Supper gradually assuming the nature of a liturgical action, those who were wont to preside at the Supper acquired the sacerdotal character.

50. The elders who filled the office of watching over the gatherings of the Faithful, were instituted by the Apostles as priests or bishops to provide for the necessary ordering (*ordinationi*) of the increasing opportunities, not properly for perpetuating the Apostolic mission and power.

51. It is not possible that Matrimony could have become a Sacrament of the New Law until later in the Church; for in order that Matrimony should be held as a Sacrament it was necessary that a full theological development (*explicatio*) of the doctrine of grace and the Sacraments should first take place.

52. It was foreign to the mind of Christ to found a Church as a society which was to last on the earth for a long course of centuries; nay, in the mind of Christ the kingdom of heaven together with the end of the world was about to come immediately.

53. The organic constitution of the Church is not immutable; but Christian society, like human society, is subject to perpetual evolution.

54. Dogmas, Sacraments, Hierarchy, both as regards the notion of them and the reality, are but interpretations and evolutions of the Christian intelligence, which by external increments have increased and perfected the little germ latent in the Gospel.

55. Simon Peter never even suspected the Primacy in the Church was intrusted to him by Christ.

56. The Roman Church became the head of all the Churches not through the ordinance of Divine Providence, but through merely political conditions.

57. The Church has shown herself to be hostile to the progress of natural and theological sciences.

58. Truth is not any more immutable than man himself, since it is evolved with him, in him, and through him.

59. Christ did not teach a determinate body of doctrine applicable to all times and to all men, but rather inaugurated a religious movement adapted or to be adapted for different times and place.

60. Christian doctrine in its origin was Judaic, but through successive evolutions became first Pauline, then Joannine, and finally Hellenic and universal.

61. It may be said without paradox that there is no chapter of Scripture, from the first of Genesis to the last of the Apocalypse, which contains a doctrine absolutely identical with that which the Church teaches on the same matter, and that, therefore, no chapter of Scripture has the same sense for the critic and for the theologian.

62. The chief articles of the Apostolic Symbol had not for the Christians of the first ages the same sense that they have for the Christians of our time.

63. The Church shows itself unequal to the task of efficaciously maintaining evangelical ethics, because it obstinately adheres to immutable doctrines which cannot be reconciled with modern progress.

64. The progress of science involves a remodeling (*ut*

reformentur) of the conceptions of Christian doctrine concerning God, Creation, Revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word, Redemption.

65. Modern Catholicism cannot be reconciled with true science, unless it be transformed into a non-dogmatic Christianity, that is into a broad and liberal Protestantism.

And on the following Thursday, the fourth day of the same month and year, an accurate report of all this having been made to Our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius X, His Holiness approved and confirmed the Decree of the Most Eminent Fathers, and ordered that the propositions above enumerated, all and several, be held by all as condemned and proscribed.

Peter Palombelli,
Notary of the H. R. U. I.

CHAPTER VII

HIGHER CRITICISM

§ I. Its Meaning and Abuse

284. It is understood that the proper and orthodox meaning of Higher Criticism as applied to Holy Scripture consists in the larger aspect of Bible study, in the examination of the literary origins and historical value of the several books composing it, and the condition in which they presently exist. It is the province of this branch of study to subject to severe critical tests the accepted traditional views regarding the human authorship, the time and circumstances of the composition of the Sacred Writings in the light afforded by modern philological, historical and archeological sciences. In other words, the chief object of Higher Criticism is to investigate the sources of the works in question, to determine as far as possible the date of their appearance and their influence throughout the ages. It essentially differs from *Textual Criticism*, whose purpose is to restore, if feasible, the original text of the books, the autographs of which have been lost. No autograph of the inspired writings has been transmitted to us, just as we have none of the originals of the Greek and Latin classics of antiquity. The question of the latter Textual Criticism does not concern us at present.

On the foregoing statement of the legitimate purpose of Higher Criticism all conservative biblical scholars are agreed. Here, however, as in other branches of sacred learning, there is a parting of the ways, which gives rise to the essential distinction and necessary difference between orthodox Higher Criticism, which we defend, and heterodox Higher Criticism, which, as a recent mental aberration, we feel it to be our duty to expose and refute. It is highly important for us to point out at the very outset the principles, if they may be so called,

on which the said false Criticism is based, and the objects it purposes to accomplish.

1. First of all, in achieving the intended results, these Higher Critics begin by setting aside the principal guide in investigations of this kind, namely the argument of tradition, arguing almost exclusively from internal evidence with the result of an unjustifiable depreciation, nay almost a disregard of all authority both past and present.

2. Along with the rationalists they deny the inspiration of the Sacred Writings, applying to them the critical tests as if they were merely human productions, dealing with them regardless of any divine content.

3. In their attempt to nullify the authenticity of the four Gospels they attribute their composition to unknown, imaginary scribes, postponing the formerly recognized dates and assigning the epoch of their appearance as late as the year 170 of the Christian era, when none of the reputed authors were living.

4. One of their protagonists, Alfred Loisy, excommunicated by the Holy See, denies the inerrancy of the Scripture, but, strangely enough, in the early years of his defection he admitted their divine inspiration, thus making God's infinite veracity the author of the errors that he claimed they contained. This heretical contradiction was pointed out by Leo XIII in his famous Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (Nov. 18, 1893), on the Study of Holy Scripture. "Inspiration," he writes, "not only is essentially incompatible with error but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. It follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the Sacred Writings, either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration, or make God the author of such error."

5. In the same Encyclical the learned Pontiff describes the destructive scheme of the Higher Critics we are denouncing, in the following terms: "They deny that there is such a thing as revelation or inspiration, or Holy Scripture at all; they see, instead, only the forgeries and falsehoods of

men; they set down the Scripture narratives as stupid fables and lying stories; the prophecies and oracles of God are to them either predictions made up after the event, or forecasts formed by the light of nature; the miracles and wonders of God's power are not what they are said to be, but the startling effects of natural law, or else mere tricks and myths; and the Apostolic Gospels and writings are not the works of the Apostles at all. These detestable errors, whereby they think they destroy the truth of the divine books, are obtruded on the world as the peremptory pronouncements of a newly invented *free science;* a science, however, which is so far from final that they are perpetually modifying and supplementing it."

6. Higher Criticism then is nothing less than the demand that the certainty of divine revelation should go down before the uncertainty of human thought; that a fact of Scripture divinely revealed should give way to a scientific conjecture, and the word of Moses should yield precedence to a statement of the gentile Herodotus. Its leading principle assumed without any valid proof is that the narrative of any event beyond the power of nature is a myth, a miracle an absurdity, and prophecy only a smart guess.

§ II. Doings of the Heterodox Higher Critics and their Confutation

285. To prove that the preceding strictures on Higher Criticism are fully deserved we quote here, as specimens of that destructive Criticism, the words of three conspicuous leaders of that school, Dr. Samuel Davidson, E. H. Micklem and Adolph Harnack.

Both Judaism in the past and Christianity since its foundation believed in the divine inspiration of that oldest of venerable records, and always admitted Moses to have been its author. As we read in the Gospel, Christ Himself endorsed it. Again and again He referred to the Pentateuch as written by Moses. "*They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.*" (Luke 16, 24.) "*Did not Moses give you the law?*" (John 7, 19.) Here steps in Dr. S. Davidson (In-

troduction to the Old Testament), and he tells us: "Higher Criticism is better informed. There never was a Moses. The Pentateuch? The Higher Criticism has settled *that*. The Pentateuch is the patchwork product of a later age: a forgery palmed off upon the credulous Jews and on the equally credulous Christians." But, it is replied, did not our Lord Himself recognize Moses as the author of the Law? How can you reject his writings, and yet not reject Christ's own words? Driven to the wall by this dilemma with desperate audacity he gives to that question the only answer in his power, an answer that subverts Christianity root and branch. Christ, we are told, "shared the common views of the Jews in His day in regard to points ethically or doctrinally quite unimportant, and consequently it can be no irreverence on the part of us critics to deem ourselves in advance of Him in Criticism and general culture." (Cited work by S. Davidson.) "The Pentateuch," he adds, "judged by internal evidence, was not written by Moses. No book of it came from his pen."

How historic records covering the space of 2533 years, containing the whole divine and Mosaic legislation of the Hebrew nation in 218 pages, can be said to be *unimportant* we leave to the Higher Critics to explain.

In the words of the poet: *Ex uno disce omnes.* From this specimen the reader may judge of other instances that might be alleged, if space permitted it.

285. In the second place, the Higher Critic and rationalist Mr. E. H. Micklem, in his book entitled "Miracles and the New Psychology," tells us how his school disposes of the embarrassing Gospel miracles. Take as an instance the raising of Lazarus (John 11, 1–49) in the presence of a large multitude of people, on the fourth day after his death, when he lay buried in the tomb a prey to corruption. "The whole narrative," we are informed, "is fictitious. Such a resurrection cannot be admitted on account of the impossibility of ascertaining whether death had really occurred. In the eyes of a 20th century physician a person believed to have been restored to life, *eo ipso* (by that very fact), can never have died" (p. 128, of the cure of the Man blind from his birth (John 9, 1–38) he

writes (p. 102): "In using saliva during the process of cure, Christ was employing a popular medical remedy in the healing of that disease."

Regarding the instantaneous cure of the Paralytic described by St. Matthew (9, 6, 8, 9) and St. Mark (2, 4) the Evangelists, he says (p. 88), are misleading. The gradual cure of the physical symptoms was accelerated by the Paralytic's faith in the therapeutic action of Christ the healer, namely through the definite order "Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house."

286. Adolph Harnack will now tell us what is the *essence* of Christianity. This is the subject which, in his capacity as Rector of the University of Berlin, he discussed before the students of the united faculties. What are then, according to this notorious Higher Critic, the sources from which we gather the essence of Christianity? "They are first the three Synoptic Gospels. Whatever can be picked out outside of these would not fill a page of a quarto volume." He excludes, therefore, the fourth Gospel, because, he asserts, it cannot be taken as an historic authority in the ordinary sense of the word.

287. "We must moreover exclude the epistles of St. Paul and those of the other disciples as well as the Acts by St. Luke. All this is irrevocably cut out from the body of reliable documents. To discover true Christianity we should then have recourse exclusively to the first three Gospels. But even in this case there is much to expurgate and throw out. The story of the childhood of Jesus must be set aside as a mythical element. But this is not all. Before we can get at the pure source of Christianity we should eliminate from those Gospels all Christ's miracles, as they are simply inventions narrated through a desire to see the prophecies of the Old Testament fulfilled; or they were psychic phenomena caused by the spiritual power of Jesus, or stories of which we cannot fathom the secret." It is remarkable, however, he says, "that Jesus Himself did not assign that critical importance to His miraculous deeds which even the Evangelist Mark and the others all attributed to them." This patent falsehood needs no com-

ment. (See John 10, 25; 10, 37, 38; 11, 42.) Cf. Part V, p. 406.

288. If we ask this notorious Higher Critic what authorizes him and his associates to mutilate Christianity thus, rendering it utterly unrecognizable as the work of its divine Founder, he will modestly answer that this is perfectly justified on account of "the sound and mature judgment, which is the fruit of our historical studies."

289. Hence to be free of professions of Faith; free of any determined law to be observed, free of the Divinity of Christ, of Popes, Bishops and Priests, of liturgy and sacraments: this is the pure Gospel, the essence of Christianity; all the rest is an abnormal afterbirth; it is parasitical; it is only the historical outer shell. Dazzled by his erudition in primitive Christianity some recent writers believe that "Harnack's authority has no equal in our times." They evidently ignore that, as has been shown above, he has told as many historical falsehoods as are the truths of which he robbed the Christianity of Jesus Christ. In fact, he has stripped it of all except the Fatherhood of God, the solitary dogma still held by conservative Jews and the Unitarians.

290. In conclusion, the Christianity which the Higher Critics and the rationalists still claim as their own is indeed a queer religion. Christ, honored by them as the best of men, was the victim of a huge illusion by claiming divinity; Christ, who succeeded in deceiving mankind; worshipping a God who could not furnish Christ, His legate, with credentials, since the latter had no power to perform miracles; a religion with a moral law without sanction, without reward or punishment, with neither heaven nor hell; a revelation destitute of competent infallible interpreters, which everybody is at liberty to explain and understand according to his whims, owing to the unfettered use of private judgment. Whether such a religion will ultimately save its adherents all but the wilfully blind can easily tell. (Is. 35, 8.)

291. We shall close this discussion with an argument against the rationalistic Higher Critics which we already adduced in Part IV, in reference to the authenticity of the

Old Testament record; I mean the modern discoveries in the ruins of old Egypt, Assyria and Chaldea—a providential disposition by which God brought back to life those ancient peoples to bear witness to the veracity of Moses and other sacred writers. Among the many learned archeologists interested in those discoveries, who have utilized such an argument in refutation of Higher Criticism and in vindication of Christian doctrine, the editor of these volumes on Christian Apologetics was fortunate enough to become acquainted with the work of one of the most distinguished scholars of our days. I refer to the Rev. A. H. Sayce, of Queen's College, Oxford. I think I shall please my readers if I let the learned archeologist tell us himself what he has to say on the subject at issue, and particularly on Higher Criticism and its advocates. His book, now in its fourth edition, is entitled "The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments."

292. "The arrogancy of tone adopted at times by the 'Higher Criticism' has been productive of nothing but mischief; it has aroused distrust even of its most certain results, and has betrayed the critic into a dogmatism as unwarranted as it is unscientific. Baseless assumptions have been placed on a level with ascertained facts; hasty conclusions have been put forward as principles of science, and we have been called upon to accept the prepossessions and fancies of the individual critic as the revelation of a new Gospel. If the archeologist ventured to suggest that the facts he had discovered did not support the views of the critic, he was told that he was no philologist. The opinion of a modern German theologian was worth more, at all events in the eyes of his school, than the most positive testimony of the monuments of antiquity. But the fault lay not with the 'Higher Criticism' but with the 'Higher Critic.' He had closed his eyes to a most important source of evidence, that of archeology, and had preferred the conclusions he had arrived at from a narrower circle of facts to those which the wider circle opened out by oriental discoveries would have forced him to adopt. During the last half century a new world has been opened out before us by the excavators and decipherers of the ancient monuments of

the East, the great civilizations of the past have risen up, as it were, from their grave, and we find ourselves face to face with the contemporaries of Ezechiel and Ezekiah, of Moses and of Abraham. Pages of history have been restored to us which had seemed lost forever, and we are beginning to learn that the Old Empires of the Orient were, in many respects, as cultured and literary as is the world of to-day.

293. "The Old Testament has hitherto stood alone; the literature which existed by the side of it in the oriental world seemed to have perished. The pages of the Old Testament were ransacked for argument against itself. No point, however minute, which would tell against it, was overlooked, no interpretation was neglected, which could assist in the work of destruction. The accuracy of language and expression demanded from the sacred historian was mathematical in its exactness; it was an accuracy which could not with fairness be demanded from any ancient writer, more especially from one whose home was in the East. They were, at all events, arguments which would not have been admitted in the case of any other literature, and had they been produced on behalf of the Hindu Rig-Veda, or the Koran of Mohammed, the apologist would himself have been the first to deny their validity. The reaction against the extreme scepticism, to which the method and principles of scientific criticism had led, began. Discovery has been crowding on discovery, each more marvellous than the last and bearing more or less directly on the Old Testament record. The assumptions and preconceptions with which the 'Higher Criticism' started, and upon which so many of its conclusions are built, have been swept away. The period of scepticism is over; the period of reconstruction has begun. We shall find that the explorer and decipherer have given back to us the old documents and the old history.

294. "Conclusion. Our task is done. The records of the Old Testament have been confronted with the monuments of the ancient oriental world, wherever this was possible, and their historical accuracy and trustworthiness has been tested by a comparison with the latest results of archeological re-

search. Scholars have unfortunately been only too ready to sneer at facts that were presented to them by works in fields of which they knew little or nothing. But in history and archeology truth is great and will eventually prevail. I have done my best to speak simply as an archeologist. I have placed the records of the monuments and the records of the Old Testament side by side and endeavored to treat them both with an equal amount of impartiality and an equal freedom from theological prepossession. How far I have succeeded it is for others to say." We deem the following language of Cardinal Logue a fitting conclusion of this chapter.

295. "The Church, indeed, now as in the past, welcomes and encourages the labours of learned men who employ their vast stores of varied knowledge for the purposes of defending and explaining the Sacred Text; but our belief in its authenticity and inspired character rests not upon their labours, but on the authority of the Church. We can therefore look on, if not without sadness, at least without fear, at the present strife which is raging at the present day, wherein the system of private judgment is being driven on to its logical consequences—consequences which, unfortunately, involve the wreck of supernatural faith in the souls of many. We may also regard, with reverential awe, the mysterious ways of God's judgments. We see that the Catholic Church, now as in the past, is the faithful guardian and uncompromising defender of God's Word, while so many outside her pale, who imagined that in the Bible they had an unfailing weapon wherewith to destroy her teaching and subvert her authority, are now engaged in pulling this same Bible to pieces.

296. "But, beyond the sorrow with which charity inspires us to lament the misfortunes of our neighbour, we have no reason for fear or discouragement. We rest firm in the belief and confidence that when so many fanciful conjectures shall have proved groundless, as in the past; when so many gratuitous suppositions shall have vanished; when so many theories ingeniously built up to support a foregone conclusion that the Bible, in whole or in part, is without supernatural sanction or divine authority, shall fall to pieces from their intrin-

sic unsoundness; when the names of the higher critics shall be a bare memory and their books shall moulder in some forgotten corner of the library, the Word of God shall still live and do His work in the souls of men." (Letter of Cardinal Michael Logue to Right Rev. Bishop John S. Vaughan on the latter's book "Concerning the Holy Bible.")

N. B. The Syllabus of condemned propositions against Modernism, reproduced at the end of our previous chapter, contains also the proscription of heterodox Higher Criticism, as shown by the following numbers of the said propositions, viz., nn. 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 27, 40, 41.

297. Authors Consulted in Part IX

America, "College Freedom. Does It Exist?" May 17, 1924 (America Press, New York).

Bampton, Rev. J. M., S.J., "Modernism and Modern Thought" (Herder, St. Louis).

Barry, Very Rev. Canon Wm., "Thoughts for Freethinkers. The Higher Criticism" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Bellwald, Rev. A. M., S.M., S.T.L., "Christian Science and the Catholic Faith." One of the very best works on this subject (The Macmillan Co., New York).

Busnelli, Rev. G., "Teosofia," 4 vols. A classic on the subject treated (Civiltà Cattolica, Rome).

Clarke, Rev. Richard F., S.J., "Spiritualism," in *The Month*, vol. lxxvi, 1892; "Theosophy," vol. lxxiv, 1892.

Coakley, Rev. Thomas F., D.D., "Spiritism, the Modern Satanism" (Catholic Extension Press, Chicago).

C. S. B., "Modernism, What It Is, and Why It Was Condemned" (Sands, London).

Doyle, Arthur Conan, "The New Revelation" (Hodder and Stoughton, New York).

Ecclesiastical Review, "Theosophy," vol. xli, "Modernists," vol. xxxviii, 1908.

Gerard, Rev. J., S.J., "Modern Free Thought" (Herder, St. Louis).

Gibbons, Rev. J., Ph.D., "Theories of the Transmigration of Souls" (Herder, St. Louis).

Gifford, Rev. M. W., "Christian Science against Itself." (Jennings and Pye, New York.)

Goggin, Rev. James, "Christian Science and Catholic Teaching" (Manresa Press, Notre Dame, Ind.).

Godrycz, Rev. J. A., "The Doctrine of Modernism and Its Refutation" (McVey, Philadelphia).

Grandmaison, Rev. L., S.J., "Theosophy" (Herder, St. Louis).

Hettinger, Rev. Franz, "Revealed Religion"—"Appendix: The Tübingen Theory" (Herder, St. Louis).

Hull, Rev. Ernest R., S.J., "Theosophy and Christianity" (Herder, St. Louis).

Jones, Rev. Norbert, "Exposition of Modernism and Vindication of Its Condemnation" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Keating, Rev. Joseph, S.J., "Antidote—Vagaries of Rationalism" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Laak, Rev. Hermann, "Harnack et le Miracle" (Bloud, Paris).

Lambert, Rev. L. A., "Christian Science before the Bar of Reason" (Press Association, New York).

Lanslots, Rev. D., O.S.B., "Spiritism Unveiled" (Herder, St. Louis).

Lemius, Rev. J. E., "Catechism on Modernism According to Encyclical 'Pascendi'" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Lepicier, Rev. Alexius M., "Il Mondo invisibile" (The Invisible World) (Vicenza, Italy).

Mercier, Cardinal Désiré, "Modernism" (Herder, St. Louis).

O'Donnell, Elliott, "The Menace of Spiritualism." Read Foreword by the late Bernard Vaughan, S.J. (Stokes Company, New York).

Picard, Abbé Louis, "Christianity and Agnosticism" (Sands, London).

Peabody, Frederick W., "The Religio-Medical Masquerade (Christian Science)" (Revell, Chicago).

Podmore, Frank, "Spiritualism." Against Spiritualism (Isbister, London).

Powell, Rev. Lyman, "Christian Science" (Putnam, N. Y.).

Rickaby, Rev. Joseph, S.J., "The Modernist" (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Ronayne, Rev. Maurice, S.J., "God Knowable and Known" (Benziger Bros., New York).

Searle, Rev. George M., C.S.P., "The Truth about Christian Science" (Paulist Press, New York).

Sayce, Rev. A. H., "Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments" (E. and J. B. Young, New York).

Sparrow, Simpson W. J., "Modernism and the Person of Christ" (Morehouse, Milwaukee).

Spalding, Right Rev. Bishop, "Religion, Agnosticism and Education" (McClurg, Chicago).

Thurston, Rev. Herbert, S.J., "Christian Science" in "Lectures on the History of Religions" (Herder, St. Louis).

Wainright, Rev. Samuel, D.D., "The Question of Questions. The Higher Criticism," p. 75 (Nisbet, London).

Wake, Cook E., "Spiritualism." In favor of Spiritualism (Isbister, London).

Witman, Reinhold, M.D., "The Errors of Mind Healing" (Advocate Pub. Co., St. Joseph, Mo.).

Woodlock, Rev. F., S.J., "Catholicism and the True Rationalism" (Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London).

PART X

THE CHURCH AND CIVILIZATION

298. "The Church, the immortal work of a merciful God, has for her first and essential mission to save souls, and to lead them to the possession of the happiness of heaven. Yet even in the domain of purely terrestrial interests she is the source from which naturally flow advantages so numerous, so precious, that she could scarcely produce greater benefits, even if she had been founded only and specially to promote the happiness of the present life." (Leo XIII, Encyclical *Immortale Dei,* Nov. 1, 1885.)

It is to a commentary on the words of the illustrious Pontiff that we shall devote this chapter. We shall, therefore, show what the Church has done for civilization and the temporal happiness of mankind; but evidently we cannot give to a subject so beautiful and so vast all the development it deserves; that would require a whole volume. We shall, however, endeavor to say enough to establish this fact, that in the benefits brought to the world by the Church we evidently recognize *a new mark of her divine origin;* the tree is known by its fruit. "*By their fruits you shall know them,*" said the Savior of the world. (Matt. 7, 16.)

Civilization has for its object the development, the perfection and the well-being of the *whole* man in the sphere of *actual* life. It necessarily requires, therefore, that he should be able to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of his *soul* and the exigencies of his *body;* that in his *family,* as well as in *civil society,* he should find order, peace, joy, all that can lawfully sweeten life; in other words, it is necessary that his welfare

and progress should comprise, in just proportion and perfect equilibrium, his material, intellectual and moral interests.

Undoubtedly, *the proper and direct* mission of the Church is to preserve the deposit of Christian revelation and to enable man to attain eternal salvation. Even if the Church had not labored for the material and intellectual progress of mankind, there would be no right to reproach her with neglect. Who would seriously think of blaming a *commercial* company for not having encouraged the progress of literature, or an academy of science for not producing sculptors or musicians? And yet history shows us that the Church never ceased to peacefully contribute to the welfare of mankind *upon this earth.* "It is a wonderful thing," says Montesquieu, "that the Christian religion, which seems to have no other purpose than the happiness of the other world, should also be the cause of our happiness in this." It will not be difficult to convince ourselves of the truth of these words. They are, moreover, nothing but the philosophical and social commentary of the profound thought of St. Paul, who says: *"Piety is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come."* (I Tim. 4, 8.)

Let us prove it by successively tracing a picture of the world as it was before the coming of Jesus Christ, and as it is since His advent, under the rule of the Gospel, in the bright light of Christian civilization realized in the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER I

STATE OF THE PAGAN WORLD BEFORE JESUS CHRIST, OR PAGAN CIVILIZATION

§ I. General View

299. In the present day when the Gospel has changed everything, regenerated everything, it is easy to forget its benefits or even to enjoy them with supreme ingratitude. Men speak complaisantly of fraternity, equality, philanthropy, of

charity itself, but they too easily forget that it is to Jesus Christ and to His Church that the world is indebted for all noble, generous principles and civilizing influences.

Assuredly we are far from questioning the *material* civilization of the Roman world at the time of the birth of the Church. On the contrary, we freely grant that it had reached *an extraordinary* degree of splendor. Our modern times, in spite of their wonderful progress and admirable discoveries, can hardly stand comparison with it. The reader can see in the book of Comte Franz de Champagny, "Les Césars" (The Cæsars), a brilliant description of the outward prosperity of Rome. Neither do we refuse to admit the eminent rank that pagan Rome held in the *literary* world. Who would venture to deny to the writers of the Augustan age the superior merit, at least, of form? Their style is enchanting and the art of eloquence had risen with them to a supreme degree. It must, however, be acknowledged that under these brilliant appearances and these captivating forms we find nothing but *fragments of truth;* a few lessons of practical common sense, a few noble, lofty thoughts; but not a body of doctrine, no lights forming a systematic, harmonious, consistent whole. In particular, as regards religious truths—the most fundamental, the most necessary for the welfare of man in this world and in the next—how many doubts, inconsistencies, contradictions and monstrous errors do they not contain?

No, this *material* grandeur and this *intellectual* superiority do not constitute *true civilization;* they can never make society truly happy. True and genuine happiness, whether for private individuals or for society, cannot consist in the enjoyment of worldly, transitory things. The real happiness of man is to be found only in the possession of truth and in the practice of virtue. It is so because, as the Church teaches us, he is created to know, love and serve God in this world and to possess Him eternally in the next; his mind and his heart are made for the true and the good, that is to say, for the Infinite and the Eternal. Much as he may endeavor to turn away from his last end, to disown or ignore it, despite all it remains his only end, and it will be always true to say with

St. Augustine: *"Fecisti nos ad te, Domine, et irrequietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te"*—Thou hast made us for Thyself, O Lord, and our heart is restless until it finds repose in Thee. Experience, indeed, tells us that our heart has, as it were, an infinite capacity, that its desires are unlimited. To satisfy the thirst for happiness with which man's heart is filled, what can all created things do? They are barely as much as a drop of water compared to the immense expanse of the ocean.

Moreover, even from the point of view of *material prosperity,* what a sad spectacle is that presented by paganism! Who does not know that the number of the privileged favorites of fortune was extremely restricted? Cicero informs us that in populous Rome there were scarcely two thousand proprietors. At the time of Nero, six great proprietors owned one-half of the Roman province of Africa, that is to say, a territory more extensive than the whole of England. The *great mass* of men were truly *miserable,* and knew of the pleasures of their masters only to envy them. Pauperism was a hideous and desperate sore.

On the *moral* side, we shudder and are profoundly saddened on learning from the authors of antiquity the frightful condition of the world before Christianity. We acknowledge without hesitation that there are to be found in pagan antiquity beautiful thoughts, generous sentiments, helpful and beneficial actions; it was because the image of God in man, though horribly disfigured, had never been *completely effaced.* But it is none the less certain that the most striking trait, the *universal and dominant* characteristic of the world before Christ, was pitiless harshness, and, at the same time, *monstrous immorality* in the institutions and manners of the people. The reality baffles description, and the corruption of our times offers nothing resembling that of the pagan world. There was in the mildest of men and among the most polished nations a hardness of heart, a contempt of humanity, a hatred of the poor, a horror of the unfortunate, a thirst for blood, murder and infamies of every sort, so great and so universal,

that with our Christian ideas, and, at this distance of time, we can hardly *conceive* criminal degradation so base and so cruel. The *whole earth* was given up to boundless pride, unbridled egotism, tyrannical sensualism, which remorselessly sacrificed everything to their desires.

300. Hear how St. Paul sums up the history of the ancient world. Speaking of the pagan Romans whose triumphant civilization had absorbed in itself all the energies and all the vices of vanquished nations, he boldly says of them with a tone of firmness which fears no contradiction: "*Foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy, filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, covetousness, wickedness, full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity, whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, contumelious, proud, haughty, disobedient to parents.*" (Rom. 1, 29, 30, 31.)

Moreover, St. Paul is the most reserved of all the ancient writers. Plato, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Plautus, Titus Livius, Tacitus, Juvenal, Seneca, all, in a word, tell us of the horrors of pagan society, with a liberty and frankness of language which make us shudder. We there see what kind of morals were those *accepted and recognized* among the most civilized nations of the earth in those times. Foreigners, prisoners, the vanquished, the slaves, the sick, debtors, children, the aged, women, workingmen, all those who were feeble, all who suffered, all who labored, in a word, the great majority of mankind were hated, ill-treated, crushed to earth. The remainder wallowed in the slime of every vice; the vices themselves were deified; they had their temples, their altars, their priests in all the cities of the world; licentiousness had become a social duty, and immorality a public worship.

Such was the pagan world before Jesus Christ. This world without faith, without hope, without love, without pity, without mercy, without virtue, a prey to every error, and wallowing in every shame, has been succeeded by the world which we know, all resplendent with the light of truth, purity and charity. Whence has come this transformation, so wonderful, so impossible to foresee? A Cross, and on this Cross Jesus

Christ, the Founder of Christianity, dying to redeem and *regenerate* fallen and degraded humanity, achieved this triumph.

Can anything more be required to make known the divinity of Jesus Christ and of His work, the Catholic Church?

But this general sketch does not suffice to make us appreciate the immensity of the benefits which we owe to Jesus Christ and to the Church, our Mother. We must enter into some details, lest it should be imagined that we have overcharged with colors too dark the short description which we have made of pagan degradation. We feel, however, that we must omit describing its most hideous details, in order not to wound the modesty of our readers.

§ II. The Fate of Individuals before the Coming of Jesus Christ

We will speak in particular of slaves, gladiators, the poor and the laborers, that is to say, *the great majority* of mankind.

I. Slavery

301. 1. The Number of Slaves. Duruy, former Minister of Education in France, addressing himself to a body of workingmen, told them very bluntly that, if they were living in ancient times, not one of them probably would belong to the class of freemen; all would be groaning under the horrors of slavery. Indeed, the figures given by history are appalling. In Attica alone, an official census, made by Demetrius of Phalera, returned 20,000 free citizens and 400,000 slaves. At Rome, individual patricians owned even as many as 20,000 slaves. According to Chateaubriand and Mgr. de Salinis, six millions of men, who called themselves the sovereign people, oppressed, trampled under foot and ground to the dust one hundred and twenty millions of slaves. In a word, the number of slaves was so great that the Senate, according to the account of Seneca, would never consent to their wearing a special costume, lest they should realize by a uniform dress

their own number. "Men are terrified," he says, "at the small number of free men." (On Clemency, I, 24.)

Slavery existed everywhere, among the most civilized nations as well as among barbarians; we can truly say that before the coming of Jesus Christ, the greater part of the human race was enslaved.

302. 2. Idea or Estimation in Which Slaves Were Held. Antiquity unanimously taught that slavery existed by *natural right,* that is to say, that among men some are born to liberty, others to servitude. "Nature," says Aristotle, "requires that there should be slaves." The slave according to pagan ideas was not *a man,* but *a thing.* Varro includes them among tools or implements of labor, and assimilates them to cattle. "There is, however, between them one difference," says he, "it is that oxen bellow and slaves speak, but the plough is adapted to both." "A shrewd proprietor," said Cato, surnamed the Censor, "must get rid of all old useless instruments of labor, worn out ploughs, old horses, as well as aged slaves." Hence, when sickness or old age rendered them useless, they were put to death or left to die of hunger.

And let no one suppose that the law took the slaves under its protection. On the contrary, *it sanctioned these barbarous doctrines.* In its eyes, the slave was not the servant but the property of the master. "He is rather a nullity than a vile thing—*non tam vilis quam nullus;* for him there was no rest—*non est otium servis;* he counts for nothing, the slave has no rights; he is as it were dead—*servitus morti assimilatur.*"

303. 3. Treatment of the Slaves. If these were the opinions current even among men of learning, if such were the laws, it is easy to imagine the fate of the unfortunates reduced to slavery by birth, war or indebtedness. We shudder with horror in reading the details given upon the subject by de Champagny in his work "Les Césars" (The Cæsars). And he only relates what all the writers of antiquity describe without the least sign of disapprobation.

As the Roman law recognized *no right* in the slave—*servus nullum jus habet*—it follows that his master could treat him as a domestic animal, wound, torture him, take his life, with-

out having to render account to any one for his conduct, for *in personam servilem nulla cadit obligatio*—no obligation exists in favor of the person of a slave. Such was the cruel Roman law. The law itself enacted that when a master was killed by his slave, all the others, no matter what their number, residing under the same roof should be crucified. It is needless to say that the pagan master, generally as egotistic and as cruel as he was vicious, freely used his absolute right over his slaves, and that, if it were possible, he would at times even go beyond the ferocity of the law, by the barbarity of the way in which he applied it. The fate of these unfortunates was often so dreadful that, to escape it, they would in their despair throw themselves in the arena to be devoured by wild beasts. Caligula, finding that the beasts of the circus cost too much to feed, gave orders to cast slaves before them to serve as their food. See M. Paul Allard, "Les Esclaves chrétiens" (Christian Slaves).

II. Gladiators

304. Side by side with slavery, there was before Christianity something still more horrible: these were the games of the circus, and the combats of gladiators. To see men kill one another or to see them crushed and mangled under the teeth of wild beasts, was a great feast, the supreme joy of the people-sovereign. The day was not long enough, hence the slaughter was prolonged into the night by the light of innumerable torches. In exchange for the lost liberty this people only required from their base and tyrannical masters bread and public games—*panem et circenses*. It was to satisfy this thirst for human blood that those immense amphitheatres were built, whose ruins cause wonderment in our day, and that very extensive hunting expeditions were carried on in distant provinces to capture wild animals alive, which were to be let loose upon human victims in the circus. Great personages were vying with one another as to the number of wild beasts they would supply to the public games, and the number of men they would thus have torn to pieces. The

human combats were yet more horrible. We shall cite only one instance. To celebrate the triumph of Titus, whom they called "The delight of the human race," thousands of men were, during *one hundred days,* slaughtering one another in the arena; and this wise emperor himself, after the funeral of his father, supplied the circus with 5000 gladiators. The *good* Trajan, to celebrate his triumph over the Dacians, gave, during twenty-three days, public games, where 10,000 gladiators and 11,000 wild animals were engaged in slaughtering each other. In the mock sea-fights, for which they made immense basins, naval combats were simulated, in which thousands of victims perished under the waters. "It has been calculated," says M. Loudun, in his work "L'Antiquité" (Antiquity), "that the combats of the gladiators cost yearly the lives of 30,000 men." It is on record even that during one month 20,000 men slaughtered one another for the amusement of the people.

And these hideous spectacles, which at first were confined to the Romans, took place soon after all over the Empire, in Gaul, Spain, Greece, Asia. All these horrors were *sanctioned by the laws,* and applauded by the sages of those days; no pagan ever dreamt of shedding a tear over the fate of these unfortunate victims. The victims themselves, on their way to death, forgetting that they had the right to live, rendered homage as a last farewell to the god Cæsar. As to Cicero, Pliny, and all the so-called enlightened men of those days, they saw in these cruel games only a noble institution, *an excellent discipline* to fortify the people for endurance of pain and suffering. Pliny, in his panegyric of Trajan, goes so far as to praise this prince for not having sacrificed the spectators themselves. Indeed, humanity was not always carried even so far. On one occasion when there was a lack of gladiators to fight and feed the wild beasts, Tacitus tells us, Caligula caused to be thrown to them a number of the spectators who were the first to arrive, after having cut out their tongues to prevent their crying out and lamenting their fate. The more fully to satisfy this thirst for bloodshed, the Senate, as stated by the same historian, decreed that in the future gladiators

should no longer fight in pairs, but in mass, as in real battles. (Annals, VII.) See Aug. Nicolas, vol. I, book I, ch. vi.

III. The Poor and the Unfortunate

305. Marcus Aurelius, the philosopher-emperor, who passes for a sage of paganism, declares without any evasion that to commiserate misfortune and to weep with those who weep is a weakness. Seneca says that mercy is a vice of the heart, and good people should carefully avoid it—*Misericordia animi vitium est; boni misericordiam vitabunt.* The truly wise, he says, are without pity—*sapiens non miseretur.* The following, according to Cicero, are some of the precepts of the Stoics: No man is compassionate unless he is a fool or simple-minded; the man who is truly a man does not allow himself to be moved or softened; it is a crime and a wrong to listen to compassion.

We would rather not recall these things that fill the soul with bitter sadness, but it is well to do so in order to show more clearly the depth of the abyss from which Jesus Christ has rescued the human race.

In a society where such maxims held universal sway, it is easy to understand that everyone who was a prey to misery or misfortune, far from exciting pity, only inspired contempt, disgust and horror. "To give food and drink to the poor," says Plautus, "is a two-fold folly: to the giver it is the loss of what he gives; to the poor it is to prolong their misery." "The poor man," says Epictetus, "is abandoned like a deserted well, empty and infected, into which the eye looks with disgust." At Athens, as well as in Egypt, a man in want of bread, who begged for it, might be sentenced to death, according to the law.

IV. The Laborers

306. As to labor, it can be said in general that among pagans it was an object of contempt. Agriculture and all branches of industry were considered as something dishonorable. Cicero barely made an exception in favor of medicine and architecture. Long before this, indeed, Aristotle had

proclaimed that labor was unworthy of a free man. Plato applied to it the same epithet. Workmen were not regarded by the Greeks as worthy of the name of citizens. According to Terence, to be respected one must lead an idle life, and not be obliged to work in order to live.

There are yet many more saddening things that might be told concerning old people, debtors, prisoners; but what we have said, following undoubted testimony, amply suffices to indicate the fate of those unfortunate creatures in the midst of a merciless society.

§ III. The Family before the Coming of Jesus Christ

307. We know enough of the degradation into which the family had fallen among pagans. Where mutual affection alone should be found, there was nothing but brutal selfishness. The wife and the child, by the very fact that they were weak, were kept in a brutalizing subjection by the head of the family, who was not the husband and father, as in the Christian family, but the master and despot. This condition of things was after all only the logical consequence of the doctrines then universally received.

1. Woman, in the opinion of the pagans, was not the companion of man and his equal; she was an inferior being both by origin and by destiny. She was practically a slave. Like the philosophy of India, China, Persia, Egypt, the philosophy of Greece has always been merciless towards woman; in its view, woman was nothing but an abject and wicked being who had no soul. Hence her position was humiliating and degraded in the extreme; hence, among almost all nations, polygamy with its infinite train of evils; hence, among the Greeks and Romans, the habitual practice of divorce, which entails hardly less evils than polygamy, and which was resorted to on the most frivolous and the vilest pretenses. Hence, also, the almost unlimited power of the husband over his wife, and of the father over his daughter. During almost all the epochs of paganism, even in the most civilized nations, the right of life and death in the husband and father was

acknowledged and guaranteed by the law. Generally sold by her parents to the man who desired to marry her, the woman became the personal property of her husband, and she was subjected to all the consequences of such a position.

2. The offspring was not better treated. The fate of the child was entirely abandoned to the discretion of the author of his days. At Rome, when a child was born, he was laid at the feet of the father. If the latter took him up into his arms, he was permitted to live; hence the expression: *suscipere liberos*—to lift up the children. If, on the contrary, the father left the child lying upon the ground, the helpless child was strangled or thrown into the public sewers, or exposed in the public squares, and there was left to perish from hunger. Infanticide and a thousand other horrors which shock the human mind were universally admitted and practiced among pagan nations. Tertullian must have been absolutely certain of not being contradicted when he rebuked the pagans of his day in this vigorous style: "Among those who surrounded the Christians, thirsting for their blood, among yourselves indeed, austere magistrates, who are so rigorous against us, where is the one who has not put his own child to death?" "Nothing is more reasonable," says the Stoic philosopher Seneca (d. A.D. 65) speaking on this subject, "than to remove useless things from one's household"; and the grave Quintilian, the Roman rhetorician (d. A.D. 118), declares that "to kill a man is often a crime, but to kill one's own children is often a very fine action."

§ IV. Public Society, or the State before the Coming of Jesus Christ, and Its Relations with Other Nations

308. **A.** If the head of the family could oppress every one dependent upon him, he was in his turn tyrannized over by the State. Among pagans there was no sentiment of human independence and dignity; individuals had no existence except for the State; they were valued only as far as they could place at the service of the State their strength and their skill. One's country was like a divinity whose orders, whatsoever

they might be, had to be obeyed. "The State," says M. Fustel de Coulanges in his work, "La Cité antique" (The City of Ancient Times), considered the body and soul of the citizen as belonging to itself, and in consequence it labored to fashion and reduce this body and soul to such a condition as to derive from them the greatest possible advantage. The human person counted for little before the sacred and almost divine authority that was called one's country or the State. The autocratic principle: *L'état, c'est moi*—I am the State—attributed to Louis XIV of France, had been anticipated and acted upon more than sixteen hundred years before by the rulers of pagan Rome. The life of man had no security the moment that the interests of the city were concerned. It was believed that law, justice, morality, everything should yield in presence of the interests of one's country. Government became in turn monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, but not one of these revolutions gave to men true liberty, individual liberty. "Pagans," says Balmes, "do not appear ever to have even suspected that *the purpose of society is the welfare, the happiness of families and of individuals.*" It was not without good reason, therefore, that the great Corneille (d. A.D. 1684) makes one of his heroes say:

> *Je rends grâces aux dieux de n'être pas Romain,*
> *Pour conserver encor quelque chose d'humain.*
> (I give thanks to the gods that I am not a Roman,
> And can still retain some of the rights due to man.)

In these inexorable constitutions of pagan antiquity, all the rights and feelings of nature were disowned, trampled under foot and unmercifully violated. "All the rights of the Romans belonged to Cæsar; Cæsar was the living law and the true divinity of the city." (M. Périn, "Les Lois de la Société Chrétienne," The Laws of Christian Society, vol. II.) "We are at a loss to understand," says Laboulaye, in "L'Etat et ses limites" (The State and Its Limits), "how the ancients could abandon into the hands of the master of the world that which seems to us to-day to be the most sacred right of the individual—I mean conscience, intelligence, labor. Religion,

education, letters, commerce, industry, everything was in the power of the Emperor from the day that the people had voluntarily, or by compulsion, surrendered their sovereignty to the Cæsars. Neither Trajan nor Marcus Aurelius, though less tyrannical than their predecessors, had a moment's doubt but that their power was without limit. They governed in the name of the people; to attempt to restrict this unlimited power was high treason."

The worship of the *God-State,* and the adoration of the Emperors, as if they had been divinities in human form, may, we admit, have inspired acts of stern patriotism; but most assuredly they were far from contributing to the welfare of citizens and families.

309. **B.** The relations between *nations* were not less deplorable. It is in vain that we would seek in paganism for the idea of fraternity among nations, or even for the shadow of any principle of justice or international comity in their mutual relations. In the eyes of the Roman, society was Rome; for the Athenian, it was Athens. Outside of Rome and Athens, there were none but barbarians, condemned ever to remain without social advantages and without culture. As a man owed himself entirely to his country, so also he could do everything against the stranger. Every nation considered other nations as its enemies, and in consequence only thought of subjugating them. Hence wars were unceasing and victory always cruel; massacre or slavery, these were, as the interest of the victor might suggest, the only fate reserved for the vanquished. The march of an army was marked only by sanguinary ruins. The complete destruction of Carthage, Numantia, Corinth, and a thousand other cities, sufficiently attests the implacable cruelty of the victors. "The day that Athens decreed that all the Mitylenians, without distinction of sex or age, should be exterminated, it did not consider that it was going beyond its right: and when, on the morrow, it repealed its decree and contented itself with putting a thousand of its citizens to death and confiscating their lands, the victorious city considered itself humane and indulgent." (M. Fustel de Coulanges in the work quoted above.)

CHAPTER II

STATE OF THE WORLD AFTER THE COMING OF JESUS CHRIST, OR CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

§ I. General View

310. "If Jesus Christ had not appeared upon earth," says Laboulaye, "I cannot conceive how the world could have survived the despotism which was strangling it. I do not now speak as a Christian. I lay aside all religious ideas, and speak only as an historian. It is in this quality that I affirm that in politics, as much as in morals and philosophy, the Gospel has renewed men's souls. It is with good reason then that we date the new era from the preaching of the Gospel, for a new society sprang up from the announcement of the evangelical doctrine." (Work quoted above.)

We have shown in another place the miraculous rapidity with which the Church spread over all the world known to the ancients (Part V). From that moment it became impossible for the world to remain as it was. And yet this prodigious change could not be *the work of a single day;* it had to be accomplished by slow and persevering labor. It was, moreover, evident that a desperate struggle for life and death would take place between paganism, hoary with age, and the new religion; between the empire of Satan and the kingdom of Christ. On the one hand was material and brutal force; on the other, truth alone and invincible patience. Accordingly, the blood of Christians flowed in torrents for three centuries. But victory could not fail to rest with the work of God. With Constantine, the Cross triumphant became a sign of honor, and, by a dispensation truly providential, the heir of the Cæsars transferred to Byzantium the capital of the empire, as if to permit the seat of the spiritual power to establish itself in Rome, which up to then had been the seat of the civil rulers.

And yet the Church had not waited for the great triumph to labor for the transformation of the pagan world. This task of civilizing the nations of the earth began on the very day when, invested with power from on high, the head of the Apostles wrought his first conversions. By the very fact that the Church sanctified the souls of men, reformed the ideas, the sentiments and morals of individuals and families, she purified and transformed *mankind*. By her doctrine, her laws and her institutions, the Church was the antithesis of pagan society; by the very fact of her propagation she was destined gradually to suppress or transform the cruel and iniquitous laws and institutions of the countries which she was subjecting to her spiritual empire. "As Christianity developed and achieved the miracle of its universal propagation," says V. M. G. Descamps, "Roman jurisprudence had to undergo and did in fact undergo the influence of the Christian idea; an influence, indeed, only indirect under the pagan emperors, but far more effectual and direct during the reign of the emperors converted to the new religion."

§ II. The Condition of Individuals after the Coming of Jesus Christ

I. Slaves and Gladiators

311. To enter now into some details, the Church, by her doctrine and institutions, was inevitably destined to ameliorate the condition of slaves by raising them up from the state of shame and degradation to which they were doomed, and finally freeing them from their fetters. Does the Church not proclaim that the slave has the same *origin*, the same *nature*, and the same *destiny* as his master; that his immortal soul has the same value in the eyes of God; that he also has been redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ; that he has the right to sit at the same Eucharistic table, and that he may even attain in the heavenly kingdom a higher rank than his master, where the degree of glory is measured by virtue and good works alone? *"There is neither Jew nor Greek,"* says St.

Paul; *"there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female; for you all are one in Jesus Christ."* (Galat. 3, 28.) *"There is no respect of persons with God."* (Rom. 2, 11.) Writing to Philemon, the same Apostle spoke in favor of a fugitive slave in these touching words: *"I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my chains, . . . whom I have sent back to thee. And do thou receive him as my own bowels, . . . not now as a servant, but instead of a servant a most dear brother. . . . And if he hath wronged thee in anything, or is in thy debt, put it to my account."* (Philemon 1, 10–18.) This is the doctrine of the Gospel. Without in any way disturbing the established order resulting from different conditions and powers, without forgetting the duties of inferiors towards their superiors, the Church emphatically proclaims the nobility of man before God. Could such a doctrine have had any other result than that of bettering the lot of slaves and gradually bringing about the disappearance of slavery itself?

Let us remark, however, that in spite of the solicitude for these unfortunates, the Church could not think of abolishing slavery *at one stroke*. In the first place, she had neither the *right* nor the *power* to do so. If in the *manner* in which slaves were then treated, there was much injustice and many an act against nature, it cannot be said, without some reservation, that *slavery itself* is *essentially* contrary to nature. Moreover, the political circumstances of the times would not have permitted the *simultaneous emancipation* of all the slaves; frightful disorders would have been the consequence of a general decree of abolition. There is no one who does not know that the whole organization of society was founded on the existence of slavery; industry, agriculture, trade and commerce depended mostly on the work of the slaves. Moreover, the slaves themselves were not prepared for independence; to proclaim them free, before having withdrawn them from their moral brutalism and made them men and Christians, or before having provided them with means of subsistence, would have been to subvert everything, to organize a general massacre throughout the world, and to condemn the

slaves themselves to still greater misery. It is never permissible to assimilate man to a thing, to arrogate to oneself *absolute* power over the conscience and the life of our fellow creature, to despoil him of his rights as husband and father. Accordingly, it is well to observe, such was not the servitude sanctioned by the Mosaic law; such was not the serfdom prevailing in the Middle Ages, for it implied no idea of moral or social degradation.

Who does not know what happened at the close of the eighteenth century when the French Revolutionary Republic liberated the slaves in the colonies? The cruel and sanguinary Civil War which, in 1861, broke out in the United States of America between the North and the South, originated, as all know, in the question of slavery, the North demanding its immediate abolition, whilst the South supported its maintenance, colossal commercial interests depending on the issue of the great contest. True to the traditions of the Church, the Bishops of the United States, assembled in Council at Baltimore (1866), expressed the desire for the *gradual* emancipation of the slaves.

It was therefore wisdom on the part of the Church to proceed slowly, as she did. She could not proclaim universal and immediate emancipation, but by all the means that she had at her disposal, she effectually prepared the complete suppression of slavery. Under her inspiration, and taught by her views and example, Governments and individuals emancipated their slaves, and the laws of Christian rulers encouraged and favored the suppression of slavery. Meanwhile nothing was omitted to improve the condition of those unfortunate creatures. (For more details concerning this subject, consult Hettinger and Balmes in the works already cited.)

312. The combats of *gladiators,* which in the eyes of a Christian nothing could excuse or render lawful, had naturally to disappear along with slavery.

These cruel games were forbidden by an imperial edict, published in 392 in the name of Honorius and Arcadius. However, the thirst of the public for these spectacles was not yet fully extinguished. To bring about their final abolition,

the blood of a martyr was necessary. On the first of January, A.D. 404, when the city of Rome was celebrating the inauguration of the new consuls, a monk, by the name of Almachius or Telemachus, who had come from the East, suddenly appeared in the midst of the Coliseum. He threw himself between the gladiators to separate them. Then, addressing himself to the spectators, he exclaimed: "We celebrate to-day the octave of the coming of the Son of God, the Prince of Peace upon earth; cease, therefore, these inhuman games, invented by pagan cruelty." At these words, a dreadful tumult arose in the amphitheatre. The exasperated populace threw itself upon Almachius and tore him to pieces. The very next day, Honorius suppressed the gladiatorial combats. (Acts of St. Almachius or Telemachus, in the Bollandists, "Acta SS.", 1st of Jan.)

As to the barbarous transaction called the *slave trade,* the Church, always faithful to her traditions, rose up at the very beginning, and with the greatest energy protested against this horrible traffic in human beings. This is shown in the noble and courageous language used in their Apostolic letters by the Pontiffs Pius II, Paul III, Urban VIII, Benedict XIV (1462–1537–1639–1741). And, again, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Pius VII succeeded in interesting the principal Governments of Europe in the holy work of emancipating the slaves, and Gregory XVI published, on the 3rd of November, 1839, new letters, proving once more the maternal solicitude of the Church for those unfortunate victims of the avarice and cupidity of man. Finally, who is ignorant of the crusade organized under the high inspiration of Leo XIII, to deliver Africa from the horrible scourge which carries off each year so many thousands of free men and loads them with the fetters of the most debasing and cruel servitude? Let us pray that, seconded by the great powers of Europe and the two Americas and the devotedness of generous hearts, the Church may be enabled to bring about at last happy days for that desolate continent.

II. The Poor and the Unfortunate

313. The poor, the unfortunate, all the disinherited children of fortune saw the assurance of a change in their fate on the day when Jesus Christ exclaimed: *"Amen, I say to you, so long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me"* (Matt. 25, 40); and when He proclaimed what would be the reason of the sentence to be pronounced on the last day: *"For I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you clothed me; sick and you visited me; I was in prison and you came to me."* (Matt. 25, 35–36.) All His life He never ceased to repeat what He called *His* commandment, a commandment truly *new* for the pagan world, that of loving all men, our brethren, as we love ourselves, or rather *as Jesus loved us.* He Himself chose to be born poor and to live in poverty; His Apostles were poor; for the poor and unfortunate of every kind He always showed a marked partiality; it was for them especially that He performed His miracles, to cure their diseases and supply their wants. He showed Himself severe only for the rich of hardened and pitiless heart. Is it astonishing, therefore, that the poor, the sick, the abandoned children, the aged, all those who were objects of contempt or victims of suffering, should have been from the very beginning of Christianity surrounded by the most tender solicitude? Help of every kind was given to them, accompanied by tenderness and kindness so sweet and so ingenious that the pagan witnesses could not refrain from exclaiming: "See how the Christians love one another!" Many, indeed, were attracted to the new religion by the sight of this hitherto unknown spectacle. And in later times, how many *institutions of charity* of every kind have been established; what a multitude of *religious orders* have been founded to succor and alleviate the numberless ills that afflict humanity!

We need not insist upon a truth so manifest, of which indeed, we have already spoken in another part of our book. (See Part V, in Vol. I.)

III. The Laborers or the Working Classes

314. Is it necessary to show how the Church has elevated and ennobled labor and laborers? The very example of her Founder and of her first leaders speaks eloquently enough. Numerous, indeed, are the institutions and the laws created or inspired by the Church during nineteen centuries in aid of the working classes, with a view to bringing nearer together the various orders of society, to establishing among them through Christian charity a powerful and permanent bond of union. The admirable institutions founded by the Church in favor of the laboring classes shone with the greatest splendor in the *Workingmen's Guilds* of the Middle Ages.

Unfortunately the fatal doctrines of the last century destroyed the edifice so patiently erected by the Church. The troubles and social upheavals which were their immediate consequence are known to all. But the Church never loses courage. With a zeal sustained by maternal tenderness, she labors in our own day as ever before to save society from the catastrophe that threatens it. Who has not read with admiration the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII, on the condition of workingmen (May 16, 1891), in which he points out with so much wisdom the most efficacious remedies for the sufferings of the laboring classes, sufferings which are indeed but too real? That Encyclical lays down a full programme of Christian economy, that forms a notable contrast with the doctrines of anarchical egoism propagated by the French Revolution. It is thus that, faithful to the traditions of the past, the Papacy intervenes once more as peace-maker in the formidable social struggle of our times.

§ III. The Family after the Coming of Jesus Christ

315. 1. Woman. In the eyes of the Church, woman is not, as in pagan times, an inferior, degraded being, the slave of her husband and an object of contempt on the part of her own children; she is the companion of man, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone; she has resumed at the domestic hearth

the place of honor which belongs to her; there she reigns through love, as the husband reigns through authority. It is by re-establishing the great law of the *unity* and *indissolubility* of marriage, raised to the dignity of a sacrament, that the Church has restored to woman all her moral dignity. Is it not the Church that has held up to the veneration of mankind a woman, the Virgin-Mother, to whom the Savior Himself has shown the most profound respect? Is it not the Church that honored widows and made Christian virgins the objects of special respect? It is thus that one of its most indispensable elements was given to civilization, I mean a character conformable to the promptings of reason and the spirit of Christ's Church.

316. 2. The Child. In like manner, in the eyes of the Christian the child is the adopted son of God, and destined for the heavenly kingdom; regenerated by Baptism, he is the temple of the Holy Ghost; Jesus Himself consented to appear in the world with all the weakness and miseries of childhood; in His public life He showed particular tenderness to children; He even declared that men must be like unto children to gain the kingdom of heaven; finally He fulminated terrible anathemas against those who would scandalize children. In consequence childhood has become since the time of Christ the object of the most tender solicitude. For children, refuges, asylums, orphanages, schools and colleges have been founded; for them are all the attentions of the most delicate charity. *Magna puero debetur reverentia* is a maxim that is faithfully acted upon only in the Catholic Church.

§ IV. Civil Society after the Coming of Jesus Christ, and Relations between Nations

317. **A.** From what precedes, it clearly follows that *public society* has been profoundly modified by the Church. By the very fact that she changed the ideas of individuals and reformed the family, the Church consequently transformed *public* opinions and *public* morality. Undoubtedly among Christians vicious men did not completely disappear, because

man retains with his liberty the possibility of failing in his duty; but vice was thenceforth constrained to hide itself, because it had become dishonorable, which was not the case in pagan society.

In proclaiming that "*there is no power but from God,*" (Rom. 13, 1), and that though seated upon a throne, rulers and heads of Governments are none the less obliged to obey the laws of God and to govern their people by *just and wise laws,* the Church put an end to *the tyranny of the State,* which in the past recognized no will superior to its own. Accordingly, what a distance there is between Nero and Theodosius, between Caligula and St. Louis!

In repeating, at the same time, *to subjects* the clear principle proclaimed by Jesus Christ: "*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,*" the Church laid down the duties of citizens. The Christian cheerfully submits to legitimate authority; but his obedience is without baseness, because it is given to the representative of God; he, moreover, retains a noble independence, and when in its commands, human power ventures to contradict openly the divine law or the natural law, the subject, intrenching himself within the inviolable sanctuary of conscience, proudly repeats the words of the Apostle: "*We cannot*" (*non possumus*)—"*Peter and John answering, said to them: If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye.*" (Acts 4, 19.)

B. It is evident that in view of these changes international relations should also have become more temperate, and should have assumed a more humane character. How could nations, convinced that all men are brethren, the children of God and of the Church, have continued to treat their fellow-beings as barbarians and to slaughter each other inhumanly?

§ V. Transformation of the Barbarians after the Coming of Christ

318. There remains yet the duty of saying a few words as to the manner in which the Church civilized the barbarian

nations which, in the fourth and fifth centuries especially, invaded every part of the Roman world.

Roman society seemed to have been too profoundly weakened by the dissolving action of paganism to be capable of complete restoration. God called in the barbarians to make them the instruments of His vengeance upon the persecuting empire, and, at the same time, to renew, after their conversion, the decrepit West. It would seem that these savage hordes were conscious of their terrible mission; they called themselves the Scourge of God, *flagellum Dei,* as Attila said. The spectacle offered by Europe in the fifth century, after being overrun in every direction by the invaders, shows with what terrible cruelty these avengers of God accomplished their work. The reader can peruse upon this subject the work of Ozanam, "Les Germains avant le Christianisme" (The Germans before Christianity). We will content ourselves with a few brief quotations.

"In Spain," according to the chronicler Idatius, "pestilence and famine followed the bloody footsteps of the barbarians, and public distress was so great that men fed upon the flesh of their own kind, and mothers devoured their own offspring."

In Africa, St. Augustine was so much afflicted by the sufferings inflicted by the Vandals upon the inhabitants of Hippo and in general throughout the whole continent, that he prayed to God to take him to Himself. "It was because he saw," says the historian Possidius, "cities ruined, villages destroyed, the inhabitants massacred or put to flight. Some expired in the midst of torments, others perished by the sword; and still others, reduced to slavery, served unmerciful masters. Those who escaped from the invaders took refuge in the forests or amidst the rocks of the desert, and there died of hunger and misery."

Italy was not more fortunate, for it, too, was ravaged from end to end. Alaric pillaged Rome during three days; and Genseric with his Vandals during two weeks—the ravages inflicted by the latter were such that the word "vandalism" has become the synonym of destruction.

The historian Gildas relates that "Incendiarism swept with its fiery tongue Great Britain from sea to sea; in the public places were seen piled upon one another the ruins of towers and city walls, the stones of altars, bloody corpses, the dead having no other burial place than the ruins of houses or in the bowels of wild animals, or birds of prey." The reader will find in the discourse of the Abbé Perreyve, "L'Histoire de la parole" (History of Speech), an eloquent passage on the invasion of the barbarians.

319. These horrible ravages cease to astonish us when we learn from history what these barbarians were from the physical, and especially from the intellectual and moral point of view. We may form an idea of this by reading the above mentioned work of Ozanam. The reader will see in Chapter III that among these people the family hardly differed from the pagan family, of which we have given a description above. Here also the head of the family was a tyrant over his wife, his children and his slaves. The warriors themselves, the only living force held in respect by the nation, were compelled, as soon as age and infirmities rendered them unfit to brandish the battle-axe, to take part with the women in the domestic labors of the family, and if they became no longer useful for anything they were left to perish. In Sweden old men were hurled from the top of precipices; among the Herules, they were burnt to death; among others they were strangled or killed with the sword, because, it was said, to be received by Odin in the Valhalla (their paradise) a man must bear the mark of the sword.

Neither the tastes of barbarians, their morals, their institutions nor their religion, which inclined to fetichism and fostered their instincts for murder and carnage, nothing indeed about them showed them capable of regenerating the agonizing Roman society. Their invasions would inevitably have annihilated all civilization, if the Church had not been there to subjugate these nations themselves and bring together both the victors and the vanquished to the feet of Christ.

320. It is not necessary that we should set forth in detail by what means the Church converted these ferocious invaders

into the Christian nations which history offers to our admiration. Nourished by the same teachings, submitting to the same religious laws, obeying pastors chosen indiscriminately from the two races, kneeling at the same altars and at the same Eucharistic table, the Romans and the barbarians necessarily would end by *fusing* together in a new population, called upon to reap the happy fruits of Christian civilization. We shall mention among the institutions particularly adapted to civilizing the barbarians, the *Truce of God,* the *Right of Asylum* and *Knighthood.*

321. However, it is easy to understand, the transformation was not the work of a day. It cost the Church much effort and many sacrifices to enlighten the intelligence and to bend the will of these naturally ferocious men, to mitigate their morals and reform their political institutions. Many centuries were necessary to polish their savage rudeness, to soften their fierce natures and to cool the hot temper of their blood; and long afterwards, along with the most heroic virtues and veritable marvels of sanctity, were often seen sanguinary customs and monstrous crimes; but at last, by sheer force of perseverance and patient firmness, the Church triumphed over the barbarian world, as she had triumphed over the pagan.

Concerning the ordeals or judicial duels in vogue during the Middle Ages, see *Études religieuses* (Religious Studies), for January, 1895. The following is the conclusion of the able article of the learned Bollandist, Fr. Ch. de Smedt: "From the beginning and throughout the whole of the Middle Ages, the Church never approved the custom of the judicial duel, and she often protested against it by the voice of the doctors and Bishops most eminent for their learning and virtues, and by the authority of her Councils and Sovereign Pontiffs. Never was the lawfulness of the duel proclaimed or formally admitted by any Bishop, Council or Pope speaking as a pastor of souls." As Dr. Brownson writes, vol. X, p. 253: "The glory of the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages (A.D. 590–1400) is not that there was then no human depravity, no injustice, no ignorance, no superstition, no violence, no barbarism; but that she was able to resist the hostile influences

to which she was exposed, to preserve herself from becoming ignorant, superstitious, violent or barbarous, and that by unwearied effort and constant struggle, she was able gradually to get the better of those hostile influences, to subdue barbarism, to restore social order, to recover civilization, to place it on a solid and imperishable basis, and to provide for its future advancement. Here is her glory under the secular point of view. The darker the color in which you paint those ages, the grosser and more revolting you prove these barbarians to have been, the more do you enhance her merit, the more unequivocal testimony do you bear to the fact that she is God's Church, upheld by His almighty arm, and assisted by His supernatural presence. Had she been human, she would have been carried away by the floods of northern barbarism, and have become herself barbarian; had she been human, had she not been God's Church, she could never have survived the wreck of the old Græco-Roman civilization, but would have been dashed to pieces with it; had she been human, had she not been God's Church, she could never have stood firm and immovable, as wave after wave of barbarians rolled on and beat with fearful impetuosity against her—she could never have gained an influence over those ferocious hordes, whose sole occupation was war and plunder, penetrated their hearts with some portion of her own light and warmth, infused into their souls sentiments of gentleness, meekness, love and peace, and raised them to the foremost nations of the earth. The greater the task that she had before her, the greater was her need of divine assistance, and the greater her glory in having accomplished it."

(See Kenelm H. Digby, "Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith." We fully endorse the eulogy of the publisher, which is as follows: "It may be safely affirmed that this great work has made its author's name immortal. No other work in our language—we believe we may safely say with perfect truth, no other work in any language—presents so completely, so felicitously, from every point of view, the claims of the Catholic Church to the veneration, love and obedience of every existing human being.")

§ VI. Catholic and Protestant Nations

322. Before continuing this study of the civilizing action of the Church, we consider it advisable to refute in a decisive manner an objection which, at times, does not fail to make an unfavorable impression upon the minds of the less observant. It is founded on the comparison of the Catholic and Protestant nations of Europe. There are not wanting men who maintain that the latter are superior in civilization, and who do not hesitate to attribute to Protestantism the honor of this alleged superiority and to draw from it an argument in favor of the Reformation. Let us set forth a few principles that will fully dispose of this objection:

1. The erroneous principles or tenets of Protestantism, as well as the truth of Catholicism, have many a time been demonstrated by undeniable arguments (Part V). As long as those arguments and proofs are not refuted, the pretended claims of Protestantism to be the true Church of Christ, remain utterly void of any value or weight. They will be only the repetition of the vulgar sophism: *Post hoc aut cum hoc, ergo propter hoc*—after this or with this, therefore because of this. Simple priority or concomitance does not in any way imply *causation*.

2. *Good* is found where *truth* exists. No doubt even a false religion may in some manner be useful to the State on account of the remnants of truth which it has inherited from Catholicity and still preserves; but it is none the less evident that pure religious truth, in its fullness and completeness, will necessarily be more effective in attaining this result. This is all the more certain, because, whilst it affords light to the intelligence, *true religion* also communicates to the will the strength to put conduct in harmony with belief, and thus powerfully contributes to the happiness of individuals, families and society. Moreover, we have shown directly by undoubted facts that Catholicity created modern civilization at a time when Protestantism was not yet born. What Catholicity has done in the past, why should it not be able

to do in our day? Has truth changed or has the nature of man ceased to be what it has always been?

3. Many of the founders of Protestantism have denied free will and have declared that faith without good works is sufficient for salvation (nn. 55–58). Is such a doctrine adapted to civilizing a people, to securing them peace and happiness? With such principles what would become of public or private morality? It is true that numbers of Protestants do not follow, in practice, these subversive doctrines, that they look upon good works as a condition or mark of saving faith. But the teaching of the founders of Protestantism nevertheless exists, and must bear its natural fruit.

4. Even admitting that in our day Protestant nations are superior in civilization, understood in the sense of our opponents, to the Catholic nations of Europe, this sort of preeminence, whatever it be, cannot be attributed to religion; for as the same causes always produce the same effects, this superiority should have existed *in each of the preceding centuries since the beginning of the Reformation.* Now, no one can deny that exactly the contrary is shown by history. At the beginning of the last century, Napoleon I was practically master of Europe. Before his time, it certainly was neither Prussia nor England that held political preponderance in Europe, but the nations which were most profoundly Catholic, Spain, France and Austria. And then, if it be true that Protestantism possessed in an eminent degree this civilizing power, why is it that Sweden, Norway and Denmark, so long dominated by the Reformation, do not also march forth at the head of civilized nations? And in our day (1901), if France has lost her political preponderance, it is more assuredly not because her Government is too deeply attached to the Church, but rather because her Masonic rulers are engaged in a bitter warfare against her, against her Religious Orders, against Christian education, and are doing their utmost to rob the nation of its Faith.

323. 5. However, we are far from being willing to admit the alleged superiority of nations separated from the Catholic Church in the matter of civilization. If it were only a ques-

tion of political power, of material wealth, commercial shrewdness, or similar things, we could not see much objection to admitting that at this moment the balance leans to those people among whom Protestantism is dominant. But a preponderance obtained by a few fortunate conflicts may easily disappear through contrary causes. Would civilization disappear at the same time as victory? Who would even venture to claim that it is to *religion* that Prussia owed her successes at Sadowa and at Sedan? It would be very easy to draw a diametrically opposite conclusion in favor of Catholicity from the history of previous centuries. Would any one say that the ancient barbarian invaders were more civilized than the nations they vanquished by their arms, or that the victorious Turks surpassed in civilization their conquered Christian enemies? During the time of paganism also there were rich and powerful nations, but their worldly renown was gained by sacrificing human dignity and individual liberty, trampled under foot and domineered in the persons of millions of slaves by a small number of free men. By the side of a few colossal fortunes could be seen among the citizens frightful misery and a degradation still more appalling.

324. 6. "The question as to the pre-eminence of nations," says August Nicolas, "is the most fruitless controversy in the world as long as we have not agreed upon *the measure or standard* which is to serve as a basis in forming a correct judgment." The measure of excellence is not, most assuredly, wealth, luxury, commerce, industrial arts, enterprising schemes in manufactures, or even political power; but it is man himself, it is especially his soul, his intelligence, his free will. Now, as we have proved (nn. 310–316), the Church has done everything for the defense of individual liberty, for the uplifting and sanctification of souls and thereby for the happiness of individuals and society. Moreover, as we have many times shown, the Church is far from despising the material progress and whatever contributes to the temporal welfare of civil society; she encourages and blesses the discoveries of science and the wonders of industry, which she cheerfully employs in the service of God. But she cannot forget that

man is not placed upon this earth simply to enjoy the good things of the world; his chief end is to know, love and serve God, and by so doing to merit heavenly happiness. Entrusted with the duty of repeating, without ceasing, the divine words: "*What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?*" the Church does not wish that "the soul should be *sacrificed* to the body and the body to the paltry interests of earth." With the Psalmist (Ps. 143, 15), the Church attests that "*happy is that people whose God is the Lord.*" How can these principles which subdue the passions and encourage all the virtues be opposed to the true happiness of individuals, of families and of nations, with respect to their threefold development, material, intellectual and moral? The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, which are the true principles of all civilization, are taught nowhere more efficaciously than in the Catholic Church. For true civilization implies a gradual improvement and perfectibility of the individual in particular, and of society in general, in their threefold character of moral, intellectual and physical beings. Hence, the three constituents of true civilization are moral, intellectual and physical progress; of these three constituents the first and most indispensable is moral progress—the very essence of civilization, because it safeguards and secures the highest interests of man, those of eternity, the salvation of his immortal soul; and as that nation is the most civilized which combines these three elements in the greatest perfection, so there can be no true civilization, no lasting prosperity, in a society in which the physical or material progress, or even misdirected intellectual culture, prevails to the detriment of moral principles and moral life. History proves the soundness of this view of the social question. In fact, we may ask, did polite literature, did the eloquence of orators, the wisdom of legislators, did vast political domain, the triumphs of industry, art and commerce save the most refined and enlightened nations of antiquity, the Assyrians, the Egyptians, the Greeks and Romans from decay and ultimate extinction? All these peoples were swept by the torrent of moral corruption into the common tomb of nations, and only a few broken

columns remain to-day to tell the traveler what were once the seats of world-wide empires. Hence, we are fully justified in concluding that purely intellectual and physical culture, even in its highest perfection, can gain, at best, but an ephemeral triumph. If divorced from morality it cannot perpetuate the civilization to which a people in the meridian of its greatness may attain; and it certainly has never raised a fallen empire nor poured a quickening stream of vigor through the veins of a superannuated nation. This deficiency can be accounted for only by the absence of that pure and sublime Faith which commanded the respect of the hordes that poured from the North into the South of Europe, as well as of that sublime moral code, which tamed those rude nomads, and raised them from the savage state to the loftiest heights of Christian civilization.

We might here appeal to facts and compare Catholic and Protestant nations with respect to morality. But we believe that statistics are not yet perfect enough to supply sufficiently accurate data to form a fair and just judgment on this point. However, in their present condition, statistics are not at all in favor of heretical nations. And then, if immorality has made alarming progress in some Catholic countries, it is precisely because the precepts of Catholicism are not faithfully observed, and the so-called *modern* liberties, the offspring of Liberalism, produce their natural disastrous results. We have, on the contrary, proved that the morality of the founders of Protestantism *would* necessarily bring about, as it did really bring about, dreadful immorality. Finally, the most moral and the most happy nations in Protestant countries are precisely those in which Catholicity once flourished. As to the other provinces, it must not be forgotten that they still live, in great part, upon what they have preserved of the teachings and practices of Catholicity, which they professed in the past. If the depravity of morals is not greater, it is in spite of the maxims of Luther and Calvin, as we have already seen.

325. Here we cannot deprive our readers of two forcible quotations which will greatly strengthen the arguments of the present chapter. One is from an English, the other from

an American writer. Right Rev. Bishop John S. Vaughan, in his able essay entitled, "National Decay and Romanism, or the Relation between Religious Truth and Material Prosperity" in "Faith and Folly," p. 441, argues as follows:

"One of the most popular, and, at the same time, one of the silliest and shallowest objections against the Catholic religion, is founded upon the alleged want of prosperity of Catholic nations. Before entering upon a consideration of this objection, suffer me to give you a specimen of what I mean. Here is a characteristic instance, ready at hand, which I cull from a speech by the Anglican Bishop of Sodor and Man: 'See how God has blessed England since she accepted the principles of the Reformation, and how He has continued to bless her in proportion as she has been true to them. Why, 350 years ago, our coffers were deplenished, our land depopulated, through the Wars of the Roses, and we had no colonies and next to no commerce. To-day it is our proud and true boast that the sun never sets on the British Empire, and in all respects God has poured His blessings on our land.' Our answer is that this is a clear appeal to the vulgar and the ignorant. What have coffers, whether deplenished or not deplenished, to do with religion? It is divine truth we seek, and the unadulterated Word of God, as the one thing needful, not 'full coffers.' 'What,' asks Christ, 'doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' If our Lord's kingdom were earthly and material, there would be something in such an argument, but He said, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' These men evidently think it is. Napoleon I once described England as 'a nation of shop-keepers.' So I must presume that this is an appeal to the commercial or shop-keeping spirit. In plain English, the argument amounts to this: Don't give up your Protestantism; don't join the Church of Rome; don't become Catholics! Why? Is it because you will offend God? Is it because you will not save your souls? No! Why, then? 'Because it does not pay. Because it is not a money-making concern. Because it will not put gold and silver into your pockets. Because, if you become a Catholic people, you may sink into comparative poverty and

lose your influence among the nations.' Here, indeed, is an argument worthy of a nation of shop-keepers! Suitable, indeed, to a 'parcel-tying and pence-counting generation.' I wonder what some of our sturdy old martyrs would have thought of such language! Imagine such an argument on the lips of the Apostles—of St. Peter, for instance, whose boast was that he had left all things to follow Christ; or of St. Paul, who confessed that, 'having food and covering, we are therewith content' (I Tim. 6, 8); or of Blessed Thomas More, or Cardinal Fisher, or of anyone whomsoever with a soul above gold or a heart bigger than that of a shard-borne beetle. When mixed up with religion and with duty to God, it is the argument of an ignoble and worldly mind. It sets religion before us as a money-making concern. In sober truth, except to such as believe that Christ founded His Church for the purpose of making people rich, and nations prosperous, it is hardly to the point. Why, indeed, should English Churchmen be at so much pains to assure us that the Church of God does not succeed in doing what it was not created to do, and what does not fall within its province, or within the scope of its institution?

"In plain truth the whole argument is really founded upon a baseless assumption, viz., on the assumption that material prosperity and worldly greatness are unmistakable signs of God's favor and approval. But is there any truth whatever in this? Quite the contrary. God has nowhere promised any kind of temporal reward to those who follow the teaching and the example of His crucified Son and who walk in the footsteps of Him who had not whereon to lay His head. Where such promises do occur, in the New Testament, they are made not by God, but by the enemy of God, the devil. Yes! it was not Christ, but Satan, who, pointing to all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, said: 'All these I will give Thee, if falling down Thou wilt adore me.' (Matt. 4, 9.) They were offered as the recompense of apostasy, of sin, and of devil worship, not as the reward of virtue. But why multiply instances? Let us rather end our exposure of the Prosperity Fallacy by a brief summing up.

"(1) Material prosperity and worldly success are nowhere given by Christ as marks of Divine favor and approval. (2) So far as Our Lord's words bear upon the subject at all, they suggest a diametrically opposite conclusion. (3) Limiting our survey to England itself, we are bound to confess that all that is really best and grandest in its Government and Constitution has been inherited from Catholic rulers in past centuries, under the guidance of the Catholic Church. (4) And that purely material wealth and commercial prosperity and worldly grandeur are not results of a change of religion so much as consequences of the development of her industries, and the discovery and opening out of her iron and coal mines, and of the invention of steam and machinery, the natural multiplication of her population, and the protection afforded by her sea-girded coast, and so forth. (5) Further, we are sorrowfully bound to confess that the superficial pomp and splendor, and wealth and luxury, and outward show, of which so many boast, are more than counterbalanced by the appallingly irreligious, immoral and vicious state of multitudes of its inhabitants; and the misery, squalor, wretchedness and degradation of enormous masses of her people. And (6) since the foremost and grandest, and most learned and gifted nations of the world have not invariably or even generally been Protestant, but in many cases Catholic, and yet more frequently pagan and idolatrous, either we must cease to regard material prosperity as a sign of truth and divine approval altogether, or else we must blasphemously assert that God, the changeless and the eternal, is as fickle as the most foolish and fickle of His creatures."

326. Our next quotation is from the late Dr. Brownson, one of the most distinguished writers of our times, in the famous article entitled, "National Greatness," in his Works vol. XV, p. 523, where he reasons thus:

"Our judgments of the comparative greatness (and we may say of the comparative civilizing influence) of different nations depend entirely on the standard of greatness we adopt, and by which we judge them. We call a people great or small in proportion as they do or do not conform to our

standard of greatness. Vary the standard and we vary our judgment. The people we called great, when judged by one standard, we may call not great, if judged by a different standard. All, therefore, depends on the standard we adopt. Consequently, in order to determine whether we are really a great people or not, we must first determine what is the true standard of national greatness.

"What, then, is true national greatness? We answer, that nation is greatest in which men may most easily and effectually fulfill the true and proper end of man. The nation, under the point of view we here consider the subject, is in the people. Its greatness must, then, be in the greatness of the people. The people are a collection or aggregation of individuals, and their greatness taken collectively is simply their greatness taken individually. Consequently the greatness of a nation is the greatness of the individuals that compose it. The question of national greatness resolves itself, therefore, into the question of individual greatness. The greatness of the individual consists in his fulfilling the great ends of his existence, the ends for which Almighty God made him and placed him here. No man is truly great who neglects life's great ends, nor can one be said in truth to approach greatness any further than he fulfills them.

"In order, then, to determine in what true national greatness consists, we must determine in what consists true individual greatness; and in order to determine in what true individual greatness consists, we must determine what is the true end of man; that is, what is the end to which Almighty God has appointed man, and which he is while here to labor to secure. What, then, is the end of man? For what has our Maker placed us here? To what has He bidden us aspire? Were we placed here merely to be born and to die—to live for a moment, continue our species, toil, suffer, drop into the grave to rot, and be no more for ever? If this be our end, true greatness will consist in living for this life only, and in being great in that which pertains to this life. The greatest man will be he who succeeds best in amassing the goods of this world, in securing its honors and luxuries, or simply in multi-

plying for himself the means of sensual enjoyment. In a word, the greatest man will be he who most abounds in wealth and luxury.

"But this life is not our only life, and our destiny is not accomplished here. The grave is not our final doom; this world is not our home; we were not created for this world alone; and there is for us a life beyond this life. In the words of the American poet:

> "Life is real! Life is earnest!
> And the grave is not its goal;
> 'Dust thou art, to dust returnest,'
> Was not spoken of the soul."
>
> Longfellow, "Psalm of Life."

"We can now answer the question we have asked, namely, in what consists true greatness? We began by assuming that true greatness consists in living for the end for which our Maker intended us. This end we know is supernatural and obtainable only by supernatural means. True greatness must consist in living for this supernatural end, and in yielding the supernatural obedience by which alone it is to be obtained. It evidently, then, consists in nothing natural, but in being lifted out of nature and placed in the order of grace, as we have said, on the plane of our destiny. The least in the order of grace is infinitely superior to the greatest in the order of nature. True greatness is simply in that supernatural justice and sanctity in which man was originally constituted, which he lost by sin, which is restored by grace, and by which we are made heirs of the promises, and translated into the number of those to whom our blessed Lord Himself will give a crown of life.

"This answer is not ours, but the answer which Almighty God Himself gives us in His revelation. Tried by the rule implied in this answer, not a few of the world's judgments must be reversed. At one stroke we must cut from the roll of great men the immense majority of those the world delights to honor, and holds up to the reverence and emulation of our

youth. Renowned princes, statesmen, heroes, poets, philosophers, scholars, authors, must lose their rank, and sink below that of ordinary men. The Saints are the only true nobility. No man is great but as he is good, but as he lives in the order of grace, and loves God above all things and with his whole heart and soul, and his neighbor as himself in and for the sake of God.

"We have now a standard of greatness by which we can determine who is and who is not great, and by which we may determine the real value of things and conditions. Am I poor? What if I am? Does my poverty interfere with my obedience? Does it or can it debar me from obtaining that justice and sanctity in which alone is true worth, true greatness, all that it does not belittle me to crave? Am I unknown, held in no repute, despised? What of all this, if I am known and honored of God? What is it to me that I am despised by men, if I am owned by the King immortal and invisible, who with His own hand will bestow upon me a crown of life incorruptible and eternal in heaven? Talk of human respectability, of one's standing in society, of the honors one receives from the State or the mob! What is all this to him who is in the Communion of the Saints and Martyrs of all the ages and climes, who listen to his prayers, and bear them as sweet incense up before the throne of the living God? Am I rich, am I honored, have I praise of men, do the crowd run after me, the wise and venerable listen when I speak? What of all this, if I am poor in the grace of God, have no honor in heaven, no assurance of the reward set before me—if, when I die, I go to hell, while the poor beggar that lay at my gate is borne by the convoy of angels to Abraham's bosom?

"As of the individual, so of the nation. In like manner as justice and sanctity constitute the greatness of the individual, so do they constitute the greatness of the nation. 'Justice exalteth a nation, but sin maketh nations miserable.' (Prov. 14, 34.) The great nation is the holy nation, rich in true obedience, and carried away by a divine passion for God and all holy things. Suppose your nation does increase in wealth, in luxury, in refinement; suppose it does fell the primeval for-

est and enlarge its borders, multiply its manufactures, extend its commerce, and make all climes pour their riches into its lap; what then? Does it follow that such a nation is great, is glorious, and has reason to applaud herself for her achievements and to exult over the poor and simple? 'Happy is the people whose God is the Lord.' (Psal. 143, 15.) Where is it written, Blessed is the nation whose God is Mammon, and whose worship is thrift? Where are the nations who forgot the Lord, who put their trust in their ships, their traffic, their wealth and luxuries? Where is that ancient Tyre, 'whose merchants were princes, and her traders the nobles of the earth?' Where are all the nations of the old world, once renowned for their extended commerce, the richness of their stuffs, and the variety of their manufactures? They have passed away like the morning vapor, and a few solitary ruins alone remain to point the traveler to the seats of their world-renowned idolatry."

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE

§ I. Influence of the Church on the Cultivation of Learning

327. It was not merely by reforming the ancient world and mitigating the habits and manners of barbarous peoples that the Church labored efficaciously for the happiness of individuals and society; she has also acquired an equal right to the gratitude of men for special benefits conferred by her in the *intellectual* order.

1. To religious and moral teaching, which properly constitutes an essential part of her mission, the Church, ever entertaining a maternal solicitude for man's progress in all his faculties, has never ceased to add cultivation of *human learning*. She knows that this knowledge helps the upright soul more quickly and more fully to grasp *the foundations of Faith* and religious truths. Hence, we see her inscribing *in her*

common law the two following sentences, which briefly and forcibly express her guiding policy: "Ignorance is the mother of all errors; ignorance is hardly tolerable in a layman; it is inexcusable and unpardonable in a priest." Who does not know the homily of St. Basil on *the advantages which young people can derive from the reading of profane classical authors?* St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome taught as did St. Basil, and spent their leisure in spreading knowledge among those whom they were endeavoring to win to God. St. Gregory Nazianzen says: "The first of all the good things of earth is knowledge; and here I do not mean merely knowledge which concerns salvation and the beauty of spiritual things, but I speak of *secular* knowledge. To possess some refinement of morals or science alone, is to have only one eye. But they who shine in both kinds of knowledge are the most perfect."

This was always the thought and conduct of the Church. The Vatican Council, in speaking of scientific studies, has solemnly declared in its first dogmatic Constitution, ch. iv, Of Faith and Reason: "So far . . . is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human art and sciences, that she in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits of human life which result from the art and sciences, but confesses that, as they come from God, the Lord of all science, so if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles, and its own method; but while recognizing this just liberty, she stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of Faith."

328. 2. Not satisfied with promoting everything that can extend the sphere of human knowledge, the Church herself has always been the most active center of mental activity. "Even in the fourth century," says the Protestant Guizot, "the intellectual condition of religious society and that of civil society could not bear comparison: in the latter there

was decadence, languor, inertia; in the former there was movement, ardor, progress." In the bosom of Christianity, the intellect was ever being sharpened by serious and profound discussions. In these was liberally carried out the maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas* —In necessary things unity, in doubtful things liberty, and in all things charity. "Inquire into the government of the Church," says Guizot, "it is to reason that appeal is always made; it is the exercise of free discussion that is pre-eminent. What are her institutions, her means of action? Provincial Councils, national Councils, general Councils, constant correspondence, continual communications by letters, mutual admonitions and exchange of views on the questions at issue. Never did any civil Government proceed to such an extent by free discussion and common deliberation." It was especially in general Councils that this intellectual life was manifested, and we can repeat the words of a distinguished writer who says that "if their decisions had not been the fruit of divine assistance, they would still remain as the cleverest and brightest evidence of human wisdom." See de Decker: "L'Eglise et l'ordre social chrétien" (The Church and the Christian Social Order).

328. 3. What a magnificent roll of *thinkers* and *writers* is contained in the annals of Holy Church! Barely emerged from the catacombs, she saw arising for her defense men like Origen, Athenagoras, Justin, Tertullian; a little later she sees budding forth the works of John Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great; later still, she inspires the masterpieces of Albert the Great, Anselm, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, Bousset, Fénelon, Massillon, Bourdaloue. Who could count the remarkable works published in every language of the earth, for the purpose of setting forth, demonstrating, developing and defending religious truth? Who but knows that the finest *literary* works are due to Christian inspiration? Is it not amply sufficient to name the "Jerusalem Delivered" of Tasso, the "Divine Comedy" of Dante, "Polyeucte" and "Athalie" of Corneille? If Paganism boasts of the age of Pericles and that of Augus-

tus, Christianity gave birth to that of Leo X and Louis XIV; if the former shone principally by literary *form,* the other rose far higher by truth and elevation of *thought* and by heroism of *sentiment.*

329. 4. Historians, who have seriously studied the Middle Ages, remark with reason that during this long period the influence of the Church is *the only one that continued* and that exercised its empire in the intellectual world. "The ancient world was no more," says the Abbé Antoine Pirenne, "but its literature survived. The Church adopted as her own Greek and Latin, the two languages which had been the instruments of the thoughts and the vehicles of the knowledge of antiquity; in appropriating them she immortalized them; and in immortalizing them she saved the ideas with which they were impregnated, the knowledge of which they had been the receptacle, in a word, *all the intellectual treasure which was gathered in them;* for a language is like running water, which contains in itself all the elements of a people's life." (*De l'Eglise dans ses rapports avec le développement intellectuel*—The Church in Her Relations with Intellectual Development). If she had done nothing more than preserve the treasures of pagan literature, the Church would deserve the thanks of the whole world. At a time when Europe, ravaged by the barbarians, saw all its libraries destroyed, it was the *monks* who saved from fire and pillage those precious manuscripts. And when every facility for the reproduction of copies was wanting, these same monks, in their cells or in the scriptorium of the monastery, transcribed them by hand and multiplied copies in great numbers. They devoted to this work all the leisure and the time that was not occupied with the education of childhood and youth, the clearing of waste land, the draining of swamps, and the erection of many of those wonderful cathedrals that cover the surface of Europe and excite the admiration of the astonished tourist. Accordingly, whilst Guizot asserts that the Benedictines cleared the soil of Europe for agricultural uses, the rationalist Gibbon does not hesitate to declare that a single convent of religious men probably rendered greater services

to letters than the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge combined. "An abbey," says Aug. Thierry in his turn, "was not merely a place of prayer and contemplation, it was also a public asylum against the invasion of barbarians. This place of refuge for books and science contained also workshops of every kind, and its lands formed model farms. It was the school of instruction to which came those of the conquerors who, animated by a well directed self-interest, were desirous of cultivating and colonizing their domains."

5. And as to the Popes in particular, what have they not done for the progress of human knowledge? "I should never end," says Mgr. Freppel, "if I were to enumerate all the services rendered by the Papacy to the cause of science and letters. I might point out to you a Pope at the head of the revival of Greek and Latin literature; the refugees from Constantinople seeking shelter under the shadow of the Pontifical throne; Lascaris on the Esquiline, next to the palace of Leo X, teaching Greek to astonished Europe; Nicholas V maintaining a legion of learned men, employed to collect precious manuscripts throughout the world; Pius II, the learned Æneas Sylvius, mingling his own science with the learning of his *protégés*. And to come nearer to our own times, shall I cite Paul III, encouraging Copernicus in his immortal astronomical discoveries; Gregory XIII, requiring from astronomy a more regular calculation of the days and months; Sixtus V, enlarging the Vatican Library, which excites the admiration of mankind; Urban VIII, whose Latin poems are justly considered among the best of the kind in modern times, and finally the great Benedict XIV, to whom Voltaire himself rendered homage in saluting in his person the most learned man of the eighteenth century?"

A splendid evidence of the successful cultivation of astronomical science under Pontifical patronage was afforded by the correction of the Calendar by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff Gregory XIII (A.D. 1572). By Calendar is meant a certain distribution of time adapted to religious and civil purposes, and pointing out the order and procession of the days, weeks, months and festivals of the year. To produce

a more accurate Calendar than the Julian, Pope Gregory XIII called to his aid some of the most distinguished astronomers of that age, among whom were Christopher Clavius, a German Jesuit, Peter Chacon, a Spaniard, and Ignatius Danti, an Italian. But the glory of having brought the great work to a successful issue is chiefly due to an Italian astronomer and physician named Luigi Lilio Ghilardi, whose calculations were carefully examined and finally approved by the Commission of Astronomers appointed by the Pope. As the "Encyclopædia Britannica" informs us (see article *Calendar*), the individual who next to Lilio most contributed to give the ecclesiastical Calendar its present form, and who was charged with all the calculations necessary for its verification, was the German Jesuit Clavius, by whom it was completely developed and explained in a great folio treatise of 800 pages, published in 1603. To carry out the needed reform the Pontiff suppressed at once from the year 1582 ten entire days (those between the 4th and 15th of October), by which the real or astronomical equinox was in advance of the equinox of the Calendar, thus making them again coincide, and restoring all Christian festivals to their proper time throughout the year. Hence, the 5th of October, of 1582, was reckoned to be the 15th of the same month. But the reform was also directed to insure correctness in the future; and the method adopted was so successful that it would now take 6,000 years to make the difference of a day between the astronomical and the calendar year, and when 6,000 have passed, it will be necessary to intercalate one day more, and then the year will require no correction for 140,000 years more. Strictly speaking, this is a defect, but it will be easy for posterity to remedy it, if the world reaches the end of that long revolution of ages. The reckoning according to the old erroneous Julian Calendar is known as the *old style*, the computation by the correct Gregorian Calendar is the *new style*. It was at once adopted by all Catholic countries, whilst the Protestant nations hesitated more or less in receiving the benefit done to society at large, on the plea, as Hallam, himself a Protestant, remarks, that a truth is no longer a truth when promulgated by the

Pope. In fact, England refused to adopt it for 170 years, until 1752; Sweden adopted the new style one year later, in 1753; and the German States not until 1776. In schismatic Russia the Julian Calendar, *old style* was (1903) still adhered to, with the result that their computation of time is twelve days in arrear of the rest of the civilized world; the Russian rulers thus preferring to be at variance with the heavens and the stars, rather than to agree with the Roman Pontiff.

It is an historical fact that at every period of the Christian era, the Papacy has always led the scientific and literary movement, as it was also at the head of the religious and social movement of the world. And here, who does not recall to his mind the illustrious Pope Leo XIII, who, by his learning, his writings, and his works, marched at the head of contemporary civilization? No one can be ignorant of the admirable zeal with which he favored and recommended deep and conscientious studies in literature and linguistics, in the natural sciences, in history, philosophy and theology, in holy Scripture, in a word, in all branches of human and divine knowledge.

There is, however, one science which Leo XIII condemned; it is: "That science, which only sees matter, and which assigns eternity to it; the science which lowers man to the level of the brute, and which by its vagaries undermines the foundations of moral, domestic and civil order." There is, also, a civilization repudiated by him; it is most assuredly not the civilization by which man perfects himself in the threefold relation to God, to his fellowmen, and to civil society, which we have indicated; to this the Church gives her efficacious concurrence. But it is a civilization that aims at supplanting Christianity, and destroying with it all the benefits with which we have been enriched through it during the space of nineteen hundred years.

As an evidence of the vigorous impulse and helpful encouragement given by that great Pontiff to the cultivation of the various fields of knowledge, both human and divine, we here quote the several Encyclical letters and the published briefs bearing on this subject.

1. Encyclical *Æterni Patris* (Aug. 4, 1879), on Christian Philosophy.

2. Brief *Cum sit* (Aug. 4, 1880), proclaiming St. Thomas Aquinas patron of Catholic schools.

3. Brief *Sæpenumero* (Aug. 18, 1883), on the Study of History.

4. Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (Nov. 18, 1893), on the Study of Holy Scripture.

5. Apostolic Letter *Vigilantiæ* (Oct. 30, 1902), appointing a Commission for the study of Sacred Scriptures.

6. Moreover, a recent proof was given of his munificence and fostering patronage of the studies by the acquisition he made of the splendid library of the Barberini Princes at the cost of 600,000 lire. It contains upwards of 50,000 volumes, and a precious collection of 12,000 manuscripts, which, added to those already possessed by the Vatican, constitute a treasure of 42,000 manuscripts, rendering the Vatican Library in this respect equal, nay superior to any other library throughout the civilized world. Besides, all are aware of the fact, most creditable to the Holy See, that by order of Leo XIII all the Archives of the Vatican were thrown open to the public, a circumstance that brought to Rome the most celebrated scholars of Europe and America, who, availing themselves of the liberal policy of the Pope, transcribe the most valuable documents, and thus enrich their respective countries with the treasures of learning stored up for centuries in the Vatican Library. "Nothing can be nobler," says he "than literary glory." Accordingly, he extolled the study of Roman letters and of the Greek authors. "The models of Greece," he said on another occasion, "shine forth and so far surpass all others in every kind of literature, that nothing more polished and more perfect can be imagined."

§ II. The Church and the Fine Arts

330. We can say only a few words on the Church's influence upon the progress of the fine arts, but they mean a great deal. "Suppress in your mind all the monuments of Christian

art from the days of the Catacombs to our times; suppress what remains in public and private collections of the masterpieces of painting and sculpture due to Christian genius, and you will have in the remaining scanty remnants the best proof of the truth that the Catholic religion was the sole inspirer of high art, the founder of all the rival schools, the fostering mother of art and artists. It is to the Church and to the Church alone, that belongs the honor of having perfected the beauty of pagan forms by the still greater beauty of Christian sentiment; ancient art had deified matter, modern art has breathed into it a soul." M. Armengaud, "Les Chefs-d'œuvre de l'art chrétien" (The Masterpieces of Christian Art). To mention Italy alone, how renowned are the names of the painters who have flourished in the century extending from Leo X to Urban VIII! Fra Bartolomeo, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Perugino, Andrea del Sarto, Corregio, Giulio Romano, Daniele di Volterra, Michelangelo, Palma the Elder, Titian, Paul Veronese, Tintoretto, the Caraccis, Guido and Domenichino!

Was it not Canova, the great modern sculptor, that wrote to Napoleon: "All religions nourish art, but there is none of them that does it in the same measure as the Catholic Church?" After a period of lamentable disdain and aberration our century has at last come back to celebrate with enthusiasm and imitate the marvels of architecture, sculpture and painting of the Middle Ages. It rightly admires the grave and moving melodies of the Gregorian chant and the learned compositions of Roland de Lattre, Palestrina and Allegri, of whom, after hearing them in the Sistine Chapel, a great master said: "I have only listened to the angels and repeated what they were singing."

Whilst the Church was thus giving to souls, with the possession of truth, the sentiment of the beautiful, and was evincing the need of expressing it by the arts, the Reformers of the sixteenth century, treating as superstition the rich adornments of the altars, as idolatry the innumerable masterpieces of our churches, furiously set about destroying the marvels of Catholic art. "The Reformation," says Chateau-

briand, "imbued with the spirit of its founder, an envious and barbarous monk, declared itself the enemy of the arts. By stifling the lofty intellectual aspiration of the imagination of man, it clipped the wings of genius and lowered it to the ground. If the Reformation, at its origin, had completely succeeded, it would have renewed, at least for a time, another reign of barbarism and reckless vandalism." By way of contrast, let us hear what two Protestant writers state concerning the influence of the early Reformers on the fine arts. Motley, in his "History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic," vol. I, ch. vii, speaks as follows: "The Netherlands," he says, "possessed an extraordinary number of churches and monasteries Their exquisite architecture and elaborated decorations had been the earliest indication of intellectual culture displayed in that country. All that science could invent, all that art could embody, all that mechanical ingenuity could dare, all that wealth could lavish, all gathered around these magnificent temples. And now for the space of only six or seven days and nights there raged a storm, by which all these treasures were destroyed. Art must forever weep over this bereavement. . . . Hardly a statue or picture escaped destruction. The number of churches desecrated (by the fanatical Calvinistic mob) has never been counted. In the single Province of Flanders four hundred of them were sacked."

Prescott, in his "History of Philip II," writes: "The loss occasioned by the plunder of gold and silver plate might be computed. The structures so cruelly defaced might be repaired by the skill of the architect. But who can estimate the irreparable loss occasioned by the destruction of manuscripts, statuary and paintings? It is a melancholy fact that the earliest efforts of the Reformers were everywhere directed against those monuments of genius which had been created and cherished by the generous patronage of Catholicism." Not Europe alone, but the whole world is covered with monuments of the Catholic religion. We owe to it the Gothic architecture, which equals, by its details, and surpasses by its grandeur, the monuments of Greece.

§ III. The Church and Education

I. Popular Instruction

331. Religious and moral instruction forms the basis of all true civilization, we should indeed say the basis of society itself, which, if it be not founded upon certain fundamental truths admitted and practiced by the masses, is constantly threatened not only in its prosperity, but even in its very existence. This is especially true in the troubled times in which we live. Victor Hugo himself declared in the National Assembly, January 15, 1850: "Religious teaching is, in my opinion, more necessary now than ever before. The greater a man becomes, the more he should believe. There is a great evil in our day; I would almost say there is only one evil. It is a certain tendency to limit every thought and aspiration to the present life. If we once assign to man as his only end and purpose of existence the earthly goods of the present life, we aggravate all his miseries by confining his aspirations to the present material world, which lacks the power required to realize them; this is, in plain language, to turn into the law of despair and hell what is the law of God and the purpose of suffering according to the principles of Christian Faith. From this follow profound social disturbances. Most assuredly, I am among those who wish to improve during this life the material condition of those who suffer; but I do not forget that the first boon is to give them hope; oh, how much our finite miseries diminish when they are relieved by the cheering prospect of infinite hope! Our duty, the duty of all of us, legislators, Bishops, priests, writers, is . . . to raise up to heaven the heads of all, to direct all souls to turn their human aspirations towards a future life, where justice will be done, and reward or punishment allotted according to each one's deserts. Let us cry out: No man shall have suffered unjustly or uselessly. Let us not forget it, let us teach it to all; there would be no dignity in living if we were wholly to die. What lightens labor, what sanctifies work, what makes

us strong, upright, wise, good, patient, benevolent, just, humble and grand, worthy of the gift of intelligence, worthy of liberty, is to have constantly before our mind the perpetual vision of a better world, sending forth its bright shining rays of hope across the darkness of this life."

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a Deist, said: "Avoid those men who, under the pretext of explaining nature, implant in the hearts of man desolating doctrines. Overthrowing, destroying, trampling under foot everything which mankind respects, they rob the afflicted of their last consolation in their misery, and they take away from the powerful and the rich the only restraint on their passions; they tear out from the heart remorse for crime, the hopes of virtue; and they boast of being the benefactors of the human race. Never, say they, has truth been prejudicial to men. I believe so with them, and this avowal is, in my view, a great proof that what they teach is not the truth."

There are, however, men who believe otherwise; they blind themselves, they imagine there is salvation for the people only in human knowledge, in the diffusion of science and letters. Well, if they be honest and sincere, they must acknowledge that even on this ground the Church has merited the gratitude of the friends of humanity.

There is not, indeed, any historical fact more fully proven than that of *the solicitude of the Church for the education of the masses.*

332. 1. In the first place, it cannot be denied but that the preaching of the Gospel is a means of marvellous efficacy for the intellectual culture of the people. Now, this preaching is essential to the Church. "*The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,*" says Jesus, "*wherefore he hath anointed me, to preach the Gospel to the poor he hath sent me*" (Luke 4, 18); hence, His Apostolic life was a continuous preaching to the multitude. Following His example, His disciples travelled over the world, announcing the truth that enlightens and purifies. "*Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel*" (I Cor. 9, 16), exclaims the Apostle of the Gentiles. The knowledge of the religious truths taught by the Church forms by itself the

richest treasury of the intellect. It is said most truly that *the Catechism is the philosophy of the people.* Theodore Jouffroy, one of the representatives of infidel philosophy, was compelled to acknowledge it. This is what he said to a numerous auditory at the Sorbonne in speaking of that summary of Catholic doctrine: "There is a little book which is taught to children, and about which they are questioned at church; read that little book, which is the Catechism, you will find an answer for all the questions that I have asked, for all, without exception. Ask of the Christian whence comes the human species, he knows it; where it is going, he knows it; in what manner it can reach its destiny, he knows it also. Ask of that poor child why is he on earth, what he will become after death, and he will give you a sublime answer, which he may not as yet fully understand, but which is none the less admirable. Ask of him how the world was created, and for what purpose; why God has placed upon it animals, plants; how the earth was peopled; if by one family or by several; why men speak many languages, why they suffer, the origin of the world, the origin of species, the destiny of man in this life and in the next; the relations of man with God, the duties of man towards his fellowmen, he is ignorant of none of these things, and when he grows to be a man, he will have no hesitation whatever as to natural rights, as to political rights, as to international rights, for all these flow clearly and inevitably from the very concept of Christianity. That is what I call a grand religion; I know this from the fact that it leaves unanswered none of the questions which concern humanity." (See nn. 266–273.)

333. 2. *Whenever the Church has erected a temple, she has also built a school.* As early as in the first centuries of the Christian era, episcopal schools were erected in each bishopric. This is proven by the Anglican Bingham in his celebrated work "Ecclesiastical Antiquities"; by the learned Thomassin in his still better known work, "L'Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise" (The Old and the New Discipline of the Church), by Launoi, Lingard, Louis Nardi, and a multitude of others. The learned Benedictines, authors of

"L'Histoire littéraire de la France" (Literary History of France), say, in giving an account of the state of letters in Gaul during the first centuries: "Wherever particular churches were formed, there Christian schools were likewise established." When they relate how in the sixth century "the Church and the Monastic Orders were the ports where the remnants of letters and sciences were saved from shipwreck," they add: "The Cathedral churches had also their schools, where the same methods of teaching were followed as in the early times." Let us remember that before the triumph of the Church under Constantine, parochial churches did not exist; there were in those times only bishopries; it was the Bishop, who, with the assistance of a few subordinate priests, ruled directly his rising flock. Later, when dioceses were divided into parishes, *parochial* schools were added to *episcopal* schools.

In his erudite work "L'Instruction primaire en France avant la Révolution" (Primary Instruction in France before the Revolution), M. Allain remarks with truth that: "The history of instruction in all degrees, in the later Middle Ages, is solely and entirely the history of the efforts made by the Church to preserve the sciences and civilization, threatened on every side. From the fifth to the twelfth century, the clergy alone interested itself in matters of *education.*" Open any collection of the decrees of ecclesiastical Councils, and you will see those holy and learned assemblies pre-occupied with the question of teaching and recommending the instruction of the Faithful to the enlightened solicitude of the pastors of souls. As early as the sixth century the Council of Vaison referred to what was then considered as the *ancient example of Italy,* to recall to the memory of the priests of Gaul the rigorous obligation for them to bring up and instruct the youth of the country.

A multitude of other Councils, for instance, that of Aix-la-Chapelle in 789, of Thionville in 805, of Mayence in 813, of Rome in 826, of Paris in 829, of Valence in 855, express themselves in similar terms. The desire or spirit of the Church is fully expressed in Canon 28 of the Third Ecumenical

Council of the Lateran, in 1178: "The Church of God, like a tender mother, is obliged to see that the poor who have not sufficient resources in the condition of their parents be not on that account deprived of the means of learning and making progress in letters and the sciences. Therefore, we ordain, that in all Cathedral churches there be provided with a sufficient endowment a master who shall be entrusted with the duty of teaching gratuitously the clerics of the church and all the poor scholars."

334. The Bishops and all persons devoted to the Church were animated with the same spirit, and seconded her efforts. In the eighth century, Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, who was loved by Charlemagne for his learning and his virtues, enacted the following decree, which was adopted word for word in the ecclesiastical regulations of England at that period: "That priests shall teach school in towns and country districts, and if any of the Faithful desire to confide to priests their little children to enable them to study letters, let them not refuse to receive and instruct them; but on the contrary, let them teach them in perfect charity. And in instructing children, let them not exact any salary, nor receive anything except what the parents may voluntarily offer through affection or gratitude." The solicitude of Charlemagne regarding the instruction of his subjects is well known. The Abbot of St. Vandrille, Ansegisus, writes in his collection of the Capitularies of that great Christian Emperor: "Charles decreed that there should be schools in all monasteries and in all bishopries, in order that *all the children of freemen as well as the children of serfs* should learn grammar, music and arithmetic."

It was the same in Germany as in France. In a work, "L'Instruction populaire dans l'Allemagne du Nord" (Popular Instruction in North Germany), M. E. Rendu, inspector-general of the University of France, expresses himself in these terms in speaking of *the times preceding the Reformation:* "Catholicism had filled Germany as well as the rest of Europe with popular schools; it had decreed that the clergy should admit to their schools the children of serfs as well as the chil-

dren of free men; that every priest having care of souls should give instruction himself or through a clerk; that bishops in their visitations should see to it that schools were opened where none existed; that the pastor of each parish should supply the poor with popular instruction. The Catholic Church had done more; anticipating or forestalling the thought of St. John Baptist de la Salle, the disciples of Count Gerard Groote taught poor children reading, writing, religion and some mechanical arts. In the Low Countries, where their order was founded, these brothers, in the XIVth century, had carried the light of knowledge and charity along both banks of the Rhine, into Westphalia, Saxony, Pomerania, Prussia, and Silesia. At the same time monasteries of women gave to the young daughters of the people teachers whom the Reformation was to take from them. Thus Catholicism had laid the cornerstone of education for the people as well as for the learned."

After what has been said, there is nothing surprising that in the XVIth century the Council of Trent should have found nothing to change in the work of popular education, and that it was satisfied to crown the edifice of common education by the creation of *preparatory seminaries* for clerics.

The work of popular education was far from having declined during the two following centuries. Before 1789 France, for instance, was covered with schools for popular instruction. Paris alone possessed over five hundred of them. There were schools even in small villages, as is shown by Article 25 in the edict of 1695, expressed in these terms: "Regents, preceptors, masters and mistresses in little villages shall be approved either by the pastors of parishes or by other ecclesiastics who have the right to exercise this office." In 1771, Guy de Rousseau de Lacombe, attorney at the Parliament of Paris, wrote in these terms: "Our last kings combined in their ordinances the enactments of their predecessors and those of the Councils, and finding public schools established almost everywhere, they provided for the maintenance of discipline and regular attendance." "Each parish," says Daniel Jousse, in a treatise written in 1709, "possesses gen-

erally *two charity schools* for poor children; one for boys, the of theologians. (See p. 482.)

In a work of Ch. de Robillard de Beaupaire, the fruit of patient research, we see that in the ancient diocese of Rouen there were 835 schools for boys and 306 for girls in 1159 parishes visited by Mgr. d'Aubigny. Similar works attest a like solicitude on the part of the Church for the other dioceses of France. "Before the Revolution," says Taine, "primary schools were innumerable." ("Les Origines de la France contemporaine"—The Origins of Contemporary France, vol. I, p. 231.)

335. In closing chapter IX entitled: "L'Eglise et l'instruction primaire" (The Church and Primary Instruction), M. Allain expresses himself in these terms: "Anyone who reads without passion or prejudice these extracts of our old synodical ordinances, will be convinced, we trust, of the zeal with which the Church of France labored for the spread of primary instruction and of the profound wisdom of the rules that she gave to teachers and pupils. The collection of the diocesan statutes of the last two centuries is an imperishable monument of her devotedness to the interests of popular education; it shows to what extent she devoted her energy to this important work and what intelligent care she gave to the subject. Those who dare assert that if anything was done in France for primary instruction, it was without the Church and in spite of the Church, prove evidently that they are absolutely ignorant of her legislation and her works." The facts are so striking that the leaders of the Revolution themselves did not hesitate to proclaim, in the famous preamble to the law of the 18th of August, 1792, that "The Brothers of the Christian Schools have deserved well of their country." This testimony, so free from any suspicion of bias, is in no way astonishing. When St. John Baptist de la Salle died, there were schools of the Christian Brothers established in almost all the provinces of France, and it is known that their teaching was free and gratuitous. Ill-affected persons even complained of their too great multiplication. "Our town and villages," said the magistrates and notables of St. Dié in 1773,

"swarm with schools; there is no hamlet that has not its grammarian." All this could not be unknown to those calumniators of the Church who dared to say, without a shadow of proof, that the Catholic Faith had dominated in the world for long centuries without ever dreaming of founding primary education.

It will perhaps not be without interest to make known the ideas of Voltaire concerning popular education. From a great number of opinions of the same kind written by this great despiser of the people, we shall limit ourselves to citing the following: "The workman does not deserve to be educated. It is enough for him to handle the spade, the plane or the file." "It is essential that there should be a class of ignorant people." "It is not the common laborers but the citizens that should be educated." As to the ignorant people, "they must be contented to bear the yoke and feel the goad."

II. Superior and Secondary Education

336. Superior Education. No one is ignorant of the fact that *all* the universities, so numerous and so flourishing during the Middle Ages, were, as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries, founded *by the Catholic Church*, or had sought her confirmation, sanction and protection. No doubt they were likewise encouraged by favors from kings and princes; but it is absolutely undeniable that they grew and prospered under the shadow of the Holy See. In the bulls instituting them the Popes give as one of the motives for their foundation, the duty imposed upon them of dispelling the darkness of ignorance and of encouraging the teaching of all the sciences. As early as the thirteenth century even the Oriental Languages were taught, and in 1311 the General Council of Vienne in France made this teaching obligatory in the principal universities. The first collection of documents gathered for the history of natural sciences is due to a Pope, St. Pius V (1566–1572), and already in the thirteenth century there existed in the Vatican a botanical and medical garden.

Whilst the universities received from the Papacy their

statutes and their powers, they pointed with legitimate pride to such men among their illustrious teachers, as St. Anselm, St. Bonaventure, Alexander de Hales, Albert the Great, Duns Scotus, Peter Lombard and St. Thomas Aquinas, the prince of theologians. (See p. 482.)

The number of students was in full proportion to the high standard of learning given in the universities. When in the sixteenth century the Protestant Reformation came and threw all Catholic Europe into wild confusion, there were to be found in the Universities of Zwolle, Bois-le-Duc, Cologne, Deventer respectively 800, 1,200, 2,000, 2,200 students. The University of Vienna counted 3,000 students, and up to 7,000 under Maximilian I; the University of Paris, it is said, and that of Cracow in Poland had as many as 15,000 students. Owing to the universal use at that period of the Latin language in teaching, each of these universities saw crowding into its halls students from all parts of the world.

In Belgium, the University of Louvain, founded in the fifteenth century by Pope Martin V, shone forth with great splendor. According to Justus Lipsius, it had between 7,000 and 8,000 scholars, of whom 2,000 were students of law. No poor scholar was ever denied admittance, as Catholic charity had provided for all their wants. There were in that town more than forty colleges or houses lodging and boarding poor scholars who distinguished themselves by their talents and application. (''Histoire du Baianisme,'' History of Baianism, by F. du Chesne.) Laurentie shows that the single University of Paris had six hundred and nineteen fellowships, founded by the clergy in favor of poor scholars.

337. Intermediate Education. As to colleges, that is, schools where classical studies were principally pursued along with higher religious instruction, they were to be found even in small towns. Generally the magistrates exercised complete control over them, but almost all the teaching was done by the clergy, who had, moreover, the recognized right of inspection. Here also it was Christian charity that endowed these numerous establishments, that founded scholarships in aid of students, and erected public libraries.

It would be interesting to compare the beneficent action of the Church in favor of education with what was done by the French Revolution, to which many writers attribute, but very wrongfully, so many excellent things. We have not room in this book for such a comparison. It can be found, as far as primary education is concerned, in an article in the *Revue des Questions historiques* (Review of Historical Questions), April, 1880, by Victor Pierre. We shall confine ourselves to stating that the Revolution began in 1793 by suppressing all primary schools. And how did it replace them? By high-sounding decrees, which did not prevent the learned Chaptal, at that time Minister of the Interior in France, from declaring in 1801: "Public education is almost null everywhere; the generation which has just reached its twentieth year has been irrevocably sacrificed to ignorance; primary schools exist almost nowhere.

"In 1789 forty-seven per cent. of men and twenty-six of girls or women, could read and write, or at least sign their names. In the last days of the Directory and even in the early times of the Consulate, education was almost null in France, in fact for the last eight or nine years it had ceased to be given." (Taine, pp. 213 and 217 of work quoted above.)

At the time that the Revolution suppressed the schools of the people, it destroyed also the five hundred and sixty-two colleges which existed in France. "Before 1789," writes Albert Duruy, in his remarkable work "L'Instruction publique et la Révolution" (Public Instruction and the Revolution), "there were to be found in France, for a population of 25,000,000, five hundred and sixty-two colleges, with 72,747 scholars. Of this number about 40,000 received gratuitous, or almost gratuitous education." "The single college *Louis le Grand*," says Taine, "possessed an income of 450,000 francs. In our day, for 38,000,000 inhabitants, official documents show only 81 lyceums and 325 colleges, with 79,231 students; only 4,949 receive fellowships more or less important. In the single province of Franche-Comté there were more free scholarships than there are to-day in the whole of France. These figures are eloquent and need no commentary." We thus see how

truthfully Michel Chevalier was speaking when he said that "since the Revolution and the suppression of the Religious Orders, France has greatly retrograded in the matter of secondary education." The reader is fully aware of the fact that the present (1901) Masonic rulers of unhappy France are carrying out the atheistic programme of the Jacobins, which desolated France during the Revolution of 1789. In fact, through the barbarous execution of the iniquitous laws against Religious Associations, 3,250 free schools have been recently closed; 10,000 Religious have been expelled from their peaceful homes, in consequence of which drastic measures not less than 200,225 children are now deprived of Christian education.

This is a specimen offered to the civilized world of the liberty granted to their fellow-citizens by the Republican tyrants that now (1901) rule, or rather *ruin*, that unfortunate country!

Taine gives the same figures, and he adds that a few years after the Revolution the number of students was reduced to 7,000 or 8,000; moreover, six out of seven students, in place of seeking for a classical education, were preparing themselves for a trade. (T. I, p. 219.) As to the universities, only one, that of Strasbourg, was allowed to continue, and that because of its Protestantism; the other twenty-three were suppressed. Naturally, the possessions and revenues of these establishments were confiscated, and the former bodies of teachers and professors were dismissed or compelled to apostatize if they wished to retain their positions. It is true that the Empire and succeeding Governments applied themselves to remedy the harm done by the Revolution, but their efforts consisted only in repairing, more or less imperfectly, the ruins accumulated by the blighting doctrines of Freethought. Do these laudable efforts confer on any one the right to revile the Church that for centuries had done far more and far better in the noble cause of education and Christian civilization?

We shall conclude by citing the Protestant historian Hurter in his "History of Pope Innocent III": "It is only superficial people who have not studied the documents; who are either blinded by the pretended superiority of their times, or

impelled by systematic hatred, that would dare accuse the Catholic Church of fostering ignorance and obstructing intellectual culture."

338. We cannot close this chapter better than by citing the eloquent words of Cardinal Baluffi, in which he draws a rapid sketch of the civilizing influence of the Church of Rome, and shows the numberless claims which she has on the gratitude of mankind (p. 445 *seqq.*)

"What we stated above is only a brief summary of the innumerable blessings conferred on society by the unceasing and all-embracing charity of the Catholic Church. What has any religion or philosophy, or any form of non-Catholic Government, or the schismatical Greek Church, or any Protestant sect, done that can bear comparison with the great and innumerable benefits conferred upon the world by the Church of Rome? What foreign nations have they converted? Where have they suppressed slavery in Europe? What cruel and corrupt nation have they regenerated by science and virtue?

"In the Catholic Church religious life was fostered and crowned with success. Monasteries sprang up in every country. Those who were wearied of the world, or desirous of leading a holy life, retired to devote themselves entirely to the service of God. Learning, the arts, and agriculture were preserved and improved by the peaceful inmates of these sanctuaries of virtue.

"The Catholic religion, founded on truth, is essentially opposed to error, but in condemning it is merciful toward the erring, ever mindful of what St. Augustine teaches, *Diligite homines, interficite errores*—Love men, but destroy their errors. Persecuted by all classes in the name of toleration, the Catholic Church, though theologically intolerant (n. 166) of every false doctrine, has always been patient, compassionate and charitable toward those that hate her and reject her authority. Like her Divine Author, she makes no distinction between Samaritan and Jew, Scythian and barbarian, heretic and Catholic, friend and enemy, but has her heart and her hand open to all.

"The charity of the Church goes to far-off lands, bearing

a message of truth and love to the rudest and most savage races. As the Father sent his Son, and the Son the Apostles, in like manner does the successor of Peter send to those who live in the shadow of death messages of light. These apostolic men have left permanent monuments of their labors in every country; and, their ranks being renewed from generation to generation, the perpetual mission of the Catholic priesthood is maintained. But what has Russia done for proclaiming the name of Jesus in Africa, Persia, China, Oceanica, or even among the pagans or Mussulmans living in her empire? What has the schismatic Oriental Church accomplished? What disciples of the Crescent has she withdrawn from the service of the false Prophet? Protestant missions are of very late growth, and the work done is rather of a mercantile than of an apostolic character. The *Word* is preached without risk, and the mode of imparting it is characteristic. It is given wholesale in Bibles, distributed by the thousand to ignorant and illiterate pagans. But there is a worse phase in their history. The emissaries of the Bible Societies often follow upon the track of the Catholic missionaries, and by calumny and bribery mar the good done by them. It is only among the envoys of the Church having a divine mission that we find the agents of God's mercy in the conversion of the world.

"Grant, O Lord, that the empire of error may come to an end, and that the light of truth may dissipate the darkness in which our separated brethren are involved, and that the heart of Thine divinely instituted Church may be rejoiced by a return to her fold of those who still remain deaf to the voice of that authority which was commissioned to teach all nations."

§ IV. The Church and Science

339. Before concluding this last chapter of our work we deem it advisable to add some few remarks to refute the charge often alleged against the Catholic Church, that she is hostile to the progress of art, literature and science. We shall do so by proving through the testimony of undeniable

historical facts that the greatest masterpieces in every department of civilized life are the immediate result of her inspiration and fostering care. In fact, all the great discoveries and inventions during the past three centuries that have exerted the most potent influence in advancing scientific knowledge are to be credited to the Church and to a galaxy of her devoted loyal children. On the 8th of February, 1853, his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman delivered a lecture before the Catholic Literary Society of Leeds, England, in which he forcibly and eloquently demonstrated the following proposition: *"Science has nowhere flourished more, or originated more sublime or useful discoveries, than where it has been pursued under the influence of the Catholic Church."* Let us here briefly point out the leading historical facts adduced by his Eminence in support of his thesis. This we shall do by giving the series of useful inventions and their Catholic authors as exhibited in the able lecture here referred to. Facts, it is said, are stubborn things; and it is exactly by the eloquence of facts that we intend to refute the silly and groundless calumny, so often reproduced, of the supposed hostility of the Catholic Church to scientific progress and modern civilization.

As Cardinal Wiseman pertinently remarks, a phenomenon has been before the eyes of mankind perhaps for hundreds, it may be, for thousands of years. It has during this period passed completely unobserved. At length there comes a happy genius who seizes upon it, finds in it a truth, a principle or law, and thus gives to the world the germ of perhaps a most important discovery. That man is entitled to be considered the inventor or the discoverer, even though what he gives in an imperfect form may afterwards grow up to something much greater in the hands of a second genius, more practical, and, may be, more successful than the first. Now, in both these ways we claim for Catholicity the glory of having given to the world many of its greatest and most important scientific truths, particularly during the last three hundred years. The following catalogue will substantiate our assertion (the asterisk * means added by editor):

1. The Pendulum, or Clock Regulator, Galileo, 1642.
2. Laws of Motion, both in solids and fluids, of Attraction, Projection and Gravitation, Galileo.
3. The Barometer, Torricelli, 1647.
4. Spectacles, Lenses, Salvino degli Armati, 1280.
5. Telescope and Microscope, Galileo.
6. Thermometer, Galileo.
7. Double set of nerves in the human body, one for motion and the other for sensation, Bellingeri, recent physiologist.
8. Discovery of continuous current of electric energy, the foundation of Telegraphy and Telephones, Volta, 1827, and Galvani, 1798.
9. Perfect Catalogue of the Stars, Piazzi, 1788.
10. The Mariner's Compass, invented, or at least perfected by Flavio Gioia of Amalfi, 1302.
11. The Printing Press, Gutenberg, 1436.
12. Dynamic Electricity, A. M. Ampère, 1835.
13. Gunpowder, Schwartz, a monk of Cologne, 1320.
14. Photography, Daguerre and Niepce, 1851.
15. Camera Obscura, Gianbattista della Porta, 1615.
16. Magic Lantern, Father Kircher, S.J., 1680.
17. Electric Lamp, Léon Foucault, 1848.
18. Music Gamut Scale, Guido of Arezzo, 1124.

*19. First Electro Motor, Gramme, recent Belgian inventor, 1901.

*20. Storage Battery, Gaston Planté, recent inventor.

*21. Preparation of Illuminating Gas, Minkelers, recent inventor.

22. Hydraulic Press, Pascal, 1662.
23. Torsion balance for accurate measurements, Coulomb, 1806.
24. Laws of Crystallography, Abbé Haüy, 1832.
25. Clocks, joint production of three monks, Gerbert, 999. Pacifico of Verona and Abbot William Hirschau.
26. The First Museum, that of the Vatican in Rome.
27. The First Botanical Garden, Pisa, 1543.
28. The First Newspaper, published in Venice, 1562.

29. The First Scientific Society, Naples, 1560.
30. The First Bank, founded in Venice, 1171.
*31. The X-Rays, Roentgen, a few years ago, whose brilliant discovery, so useful in surgery, is the theme of universal praise.
*32. Wireless Telegraphy, G. Marconi, born 1879.

In the teeth of such evidence, how is it possible that the Catholic Church should have been or should be called the vigorous and persistent enemy of the highest intellectual life of mankind? For a list of distinguished scientists, both Christian and Catholic, see vol. I, pp. 555, 556.

Moreover, the introduction of the inductive or experimental method, which gave so many astounding results in the study of natural sciences, is another achievement due to Catholic genius, especially to Roger Bacon (1294), a famous friar, and Leonardo da Vinci. J. W. Draper, whom no one will accuse of being partial to Catholics, alluding to the latter distinguished scientist, writes as follows: "To him, and not to Lord Bacon, must be attributed the renaissance of science. Bacon was not only ignorant of mathematics, but deprecated its application to physical inquiries. He contemptuously rejected the Copernican system, alleging absurd objections against it. While Galileo was on the brink of his great telescopic discoveries, Bacon in England was publishing doubts as to the utility of instruments in scientific investigations. To ascribe the inductive method to him is to ignore history."

Sixty-two Catholic universities were either founded by the Roman Pontiffs themselves or established with their approval and under their auspices, namely at: Aberdeen, Basel, Berges, Bologna, Bordeaux, Cahors, Cambridge, Coimbra, Cologne, Copenhagen, Cracow, Dublin, Drogheda, Erfurt, Florence, Freiburg, Glasgow, Grenoble, Greifswald, Heidelberg, Huesca, Ingolstadt, Leipsic, Lérida, Lima, Louvain, Mainz, Nantes, Naples, Ofen, Orleans, Oxford, Padua, Paris, Pavia, Perugia, Piacenza, Prague, Poitiers, Rome, Rostock, St. Andrew, Salamanca, Seville, Siena, Santo Domingo, Tübingen, Toulouse, Turin, Trevisio, Trier, Upsala, Valence,

Valencia, Valladolid, Vercelli, Vienna, Washington, D. C. (Catholic University of America), Wittenberg, Würzburg.—From *The Catholic Mind* (America Press, January 22, 1924).

340. The reader is now fully prepared to appreciate the following quotation from Dr. Brownson, vol. VI, p. 547:

"The *Methodist Quarterly Review* for July, 1844, writes: 'Except painting and sculpture, no one of the arts or sciences has escaped the anathemas of Rome.' When and where has Rome ever anathematized any art or science? Music is both an art and a science; has Rome ever anathematized it? Architecture, whether as an art or a science, when has Rome ever anathematized it? We have heard of the Gothic architecture, the admiration and despair of our modern architects, which sprang up in the Middle Ages, and which we have been accustomed to regard as Catholic. Perchance the glorious old cathedrals, of which European tourists tell us so much, were all built by Protestants, and the modern meeting-houses have been designed by Catholic architects! Mechanics is a science; has Rome ever anathematized it? According to the confession of Mr. Whewell, it was completed, so far as it remained for moderns to complete it, by Leonardo da Vinci and Galileo—for Da Vinci anticipated the discoveries of Stevenus—both Catholics, and honored at Rome, and the latter a pensioner of the Church. Astronomy, we have seen, owes to Rome its principal discoverers and encouragement. Metaphysics is almost exclusively a Catholic science. Bacon is more than matched by Campanella or Descartes. Leibnitz owed his eminence to his acquaintance with the Scholastics, and St. Thomas Aquinas alone will weigh down the whole race of modern German metaphysicians. Italy and France early took the lead in history, and still keep it. In poetry, the Catholics are more than successful rivals of the Protestants. Shakespeare is no Protestant, at least in sentiment. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Tasso, Ariosto, are all Catholics and Italians. The Spanish and Portuguese poetry is not to be despised; and take away from the poetry of Germany and England what is not Protestant, and neither surpasses France in this department, in which France is poorest. Has Rome

ever anathematized logic? If the reviewer believes it, we ask him to read a Catholic course of theology—no matter what one, but any one prepared for young theological students —and he will very soon change his mind. The truth is, all the great, leading scientific discoveries and inventions of which we boast, Christendom owes to Catholics. Parchment and paper, printing and engraving, improved glass and steel, gunpowder, clocks, telescopes, the mariner's compass, the reformed calendar, decimal notation, algebra, trigonometry, chemistry, counterpoint, equivalent to a new creation in music, are all possessions inherited from our Catholic ancestors. The great maritime discoveries, the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, and the New World, were all made by Catholics before Protestantism was born. The principle of the steam-engine was discovered by Roger Bacon, and the application of steam to navigation was first made by a Spanish Catholic in the early part of the seventeenth century. The application of the sciences to the industrial arts received its principal developments in Catholic countries, and has made any considerable progress in Protestant countries only since the middle of the last century, that is, since the obvious decline of Protestantism in those countries. And yet, a writer who probably never read a Catholic book in his life, and who, we will venture to assert, cannot state correctly a single distinctive dogma of the Catholic Church, and who proves himself by his reckless assertions utterly ignorant of her history, has the impudence to say, that, excepting painting and sculpture, 'no one of the arts or sciences has escaped the anathemas of Rome!' "

As history and experience teach us, the bitterest accusers and calumniators of the Catholic Church on the score of her supposed or pretended hostility to literature, learning and science, are generally recruited from the ranks of the successors of the early Reformers, from every sect of the manifold Protestant creeds. Now, not by way of retaliation, which would be ungenerous, but simply to offer a striking contrast, we deem it advisable to call the attention of our readers to the following historical facts based on the statements of three Protestant writers of repute. Mr. W. Dunn Murray, in his

annals of the Bodleian Library, relates the following facts: "Oxford, as Gladstone writes (*Nineteenth Century,* March, 1890), had received noble gifts for her university library. And we have to recollect, with shame, that that institution (the university library), was plundered and destroyed by the Commissioners of the boy King, Edward VI, acting in the name of the Reformation of religion. The Reformers, under pretence of rooting out Popery, superstition and idolatry, utterly destroyed two noble libraries at Oxford, and embezzled, sold, burnt or tore to pieces all those valuable books, which their founders had been so diligent in procuring from every country of Europe. Whole libraries were destroyed by the Reformers, or made waste paper of, or consumed for the vilest uses." Froude, alluding to the same reckless destroyers, says: "Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets, college libraries plundered and burned."

Maitland in his classical work, "The Dark Ages" (sixth edition, p. 319, note), states the following facts, taken from the writers he there quotes. "To return to the royal delegates, they were found doing such things as did not at all become those who professed to be learned and Christian men. For the principal ornaments, and, at the same time, supports of the University, that is, the libraries filled with innumerable works, both native and foreign, they permitted or directed to be despoiled. Hence, a great multitude of manuscripts were adjudged to the flames, or to the vilest purposes. The mischief committed at this time can scarcely be conceived. I have seen several fine old chronicles and volumes of miscellaneous literature mutilated, because the illuminations were supposed, by the reforming inspectors, to represent Popes and saints, when they were really intended for the portraits of kings and warriors; nay, some were actually mathematical figures! The motive of these barbarians was only equalled by their ignorance." (Editor of the "Athenæ" of Anthony Wood, p. 468.) If the descendants of the sixteenth century vandals were to reflect on the doings of their ancestors, they would soon find out that the enemies of learning, literature, science and progress were not the Catholic builders of universities and the

founders of their libraries, but their ruthless destroyers, the disciples of Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII.

Theological Studies. It is admitted on all hands that the excellence of any scientific knowledge is principally derived from the nobility and loftiness of the being that forms its object. Judged by this standard, Theology, the science of the Deity, is, no doubt, the most excellent, as well as the most useful, of all the sciences that may engage the intellect of man. Universal nature, that is, every being distinct from God, is only the footstool of the Divinity, and not itself a god, before which man should lie prostrate in adoration. Now to know the zeal, energy, ardor, and, I might say, the enthusiasm, with which that noblest of sciences, theology, has been cultivated under the inspiration and auspices of the Catholic Church, we need but call to mind the astounding fact that from the year of the Christian era 1109, when theological studies began to be systematically pursued, to the year 1894, there flourished within her fold not less than 12,208 theological writers. This statement the reader can easily verify by consulting that most valuable work of Fr. H. Hurter, S.J., entitled "Nomenclator Litterarius," in four volumes (Herder, St. Louis), in which the author gives us as the result of his indefatigable labors the literary history of Catholic theology from the beginning of the Middle Ages down to the present time. Is there anything outside of the Catholic Church that can compare with this brilliant array of theological writers? We might allege a similar array of Catholic writers in all the branches of mental philosophy, which in excellence ranks next to theology, and is as far superior to all natural sciences as mind is superior to matter.

But our limits do not permit us to proceed, and we must hasten to conclude. That great statesman and scholar, the late W. E. Gladstone, expresses in one sentence all that might be said on the present subject, when he declares that, "since the first three hundred years of persecution the Roman Catholic Church has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of human civilization, and has driven, harnessed to its chariot as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual

and material forces of the world; its art, the art of the world; its genius, the genius of the world; its greatness, glory and grandeur and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that in these respects the world has had to boast of."

Authors Consulted in Part X

Brownson, O., Works, vols. III, VI, XIII, XVII (Thorndike Nourse, Detroit, Mich.).

Digby, Kenelm H., "Mores Catholici or Ages of Faith" (O'Shea, New York).

Drane, Theodosia Augusta, "Christian Schools and Scholars" (Burns & Oates, London).

Döllinger, Rev. John J., "The Gentile and the Jew," 2 vols., published in 1857 (Giblings and Co., London).

Egan, Maurice Francis, "Glories of the Catholic Church in Art, Literature and History" (McBride, Chicago).

Graham, Rev. Henry, "Prosperity, Catholic and Protestant" (Herder, St. Louis, Mo.).

Healy, Most Rev. John, "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars" (Gill, Dublin).

Kurth, G., "The Church at the Turning Points of History" (Naegile Printing Office, Helena, Montana).

Leibell, Helen Dominica, "Anglo-Saxon Education of Women" (Georgetown University Press, Washington, D. C.).

Neligan, Rev. W. H., "Rome, Its Churches, Its Charities and Its Schools" (Dunigan, New York).

O'Connor, Very Rev. John B., O.P., "Monasticism and Civilization" (Kenedy, New York).

Parsons, Rev. R., "Studies in Church History," vol. VI (Pustet, New York).

Ronayne, Rev. Maurice, S.J., "Religion and Science" (P. Collier, New York).

Schanz, Rev. A., "Christian Apology," vol. III, "The Church and Civilization" (Pustet, New York).

Windle, Sir Bertram C. A., "The Church and Science" (Herder, St. Louis).

Wiseman, Cardinal Nicholas, "Lecture on Church and Science" (Burns & Oates, London).

Walsh, James J., M.D., Ph.D., "The Popes and Science" (Fordham University Press, New York); "The Thirteenth the Greatest of Centuries" (Catholic Summer School Press, New York); "Catholic Churchmen and Science" (The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia); "What Civilization Owes to Italy" (The Stratford Co., Boston).

General Conclusion of This Work

341. All honor to the Catholic Church, our Mother, who, after having saved humanity from the deluge of corruption, in which it had been plunged by paganism, raised it up a second time from the ruins accumulated by the invasion of the barbarians! All honor to the Church who has *known how* to mould and cement together in such an admirable manner the gross elements placed under her hands by the irruption of the primitive Northern hordes and other barbarians; by fusing these new people with the ancient population, the Church formed the modern nations, whose civilizations throw so much splendor upon the whole world! All honor to the Church whose history never ceases to proclaim the beneficent action she exerted on behalf of mankind during the course of nineteen centuries down to our days! That which she has done in the past by her doctrine, her laws, her institutions, and the divine grace which she communicates to the souls of the Faithful, the Church can, and desires to, realize once more, for she has lost nothing of her fecundity and immortal youth.

And yet, notwithstanding her immense and incalculable services, the Church remains subject to innumerable attacks. Freemasonry, combining all the forces of which the enemies of Jesus Christ can dispose, would fain at last give the lie to the prophetic words which promised immortality to the divine work.

We need have no fear as to the fate of Holy Church. Listen to what the illustrious St. Augustine, as far back as

fourteen centuries ago, said on this subject: "They see the Church and they say, 'She is about to die; soon her very name will disappear; there will be no more Christians; they have had their day.' Whilst they are thus speaking I see these very men die themselves, day by day, and the Church stands forth proclaiming the power of God to all succeeding generations."

342. In his turn the celebrated Protestant essayist, Lord Macaulay, says: "The Papacy remains not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor. Nor do we see any signs which indicate that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the Governments, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments, that now exist in the world. She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot on Britain, before the Franks had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the Temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul." (Review of Ranke's "History of the Popes.")

Assuredly, the divine promises authorize us to look to the future with confidence. The Church may be persecuted, as her divine Founder and Master, for she is the *militant* Church on earth; whole kingdoms may even lose the inestimable benefit of Catholic Faith. But what she may lose on the one hand, Providence returns to her on the other.

As Bossuet remarks in his famous "Discourse on Universal History": "The Catholic Church is, no doubt, often subject to severe trials. But what matters it, after all, if a few rotten branches are torn from her? Her vigor is not thereby destroyed. She puts forth from her living trunk other branches, and the pruning of the useless wood only serves to improve her fruits."

"The study of the Catholic system," says Ernest Naville, Protestant professor at Geneva, 1839, "clearly convinces us that it is logical, that it is beautiful, that the foundations

upon which it rests are deeply rooted in human nature. I am persuaded that any one can sustain victoriously this dilemma: Either Jesus Christ did not establish a Church, or if He did, the Catholic Church is the one He established."

What, indeed, is now occurring under our own eyes? Whilst persecution, stirred up by the Masonic sects, is let loose against her, the Roman Church sees the bonds of her indestructible unity growing around her more firmly and closely than ever; now, more than ever before, the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff is heard with ever increasing veneration, docility and love by the Pastors and the Faithful. Abroad the Gospel, far from tending to disappear, on the contrary extends each day its peaceful conquests. The work of distant foreign missions, interrupted by the disturbances of the last century, has received in our day a new and extraordinary impulse. The annals of the Propagation of the Faith are there to attest the marvels of contemporary apostolate in countries of Africa unexplored before our times, as well as in the most savage islands of Oceanica, in the very center of Islamism as well as in the midst of Asiatic idolatry. And to cite but one fact, whilst at the time of the 2d Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 there were in the United States but seven Archbishops and thirty-seven Bishops, there met not long ago (1884), in that same city and for the same purpose, fourteen Archbishops and seventy-five Bishops. Such in a few years is the progress of the Faith in a single country! To-day in the United States there are 14 archdioceses and 86 dioceses. (Catholic Directory for 1924.)

And again, the very sufferings of the Church are a reason for greater confidence in the future, for the Church is the living image of Jesus Christ; the Savior Himself had to pass through the Agony of Gethsemane to attain the glory of His triumphant Resurrection. *Oportuit Christum pati et ita intrare in gloriam suam.* (Luke 24, 26.)

The life of the Church will therefore be in the future, as in the past, a perpetual alternative of combat and triumph, until that day marked by Providence will shine forth, when, leaving the arena which has seen so many glorious struggles,

she will introduce the last of the Elect into the heavenly Jerusalem.

On that great day of joy and glory shall we be among the children of the Church *triumphant?* Shall we have a part in the boundless and endless happiness which God has prepared from the beginning for His beloved children? Yes, such shall be our lot, if in our short pilgrimage in this world we shall have remained true to the Church, our Mother, by the profession of Faith and the performance of good works; if with the Church we shall have bravely labored, struggled and suffered for the cause of God; if with our last breath we can truthfully repeat those words of St. Paul: *"I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. For the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to me in that day, and not to me only, but to them also who love his coming."* (II Tim. 4, 7, 8.)

THE END

A. M. D. G.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

(Vol. II)

(The numbers indicate the page.)

Agnosticism, what it is, 339
—— its chief error, 341
—— excludes authority, 342
—— often due to moral lapse, 343
Angels, their natural powers, 376
Arts, fine, and the Catholic Church, 464, 483

Baptism of blood and salvation, 240
—— of desire and salvation, 239, 241
Bible, which versions are forbidden, 48
Bishops, whence their powers, 36
—— whence their jurisdiction, 36

Calendar, Gregorian, 461
Calvin, his pretended miracle, 70
Catholic Church, defined, 4-6
—— her threefold office, 137
—— priestly office, 138, 143
—— teaching office, 139
—— ruling office, 144
—— her relations with the State, 170
—— and culture, 457
—— and fine arts, 464, 483
—— what she owes to the State, 180
—— her end, 11
—— her constitution, 11
Christ, Founder of the Church, 8
Christianity, its essence according to Harnack, 410
—— and conversion of Barbarians, 441
Christian Science, an arrogant misnomer, 352
—— neither Christian nor scientific, 353
—— its boasted cures, 355
—— no barrier to immorality, 358
—— no true Christians may join it, 359
—— denies all the articles of the Apostles' Creed, 353
Church, only one, founded by Christ, 2
—— United Greek, 89
Copernican System and early reformers, 276, 281
Copernicus, Canon, his discovery, 276
Criticism, Higher, its meaning, 406, 407
—— condemned by Leo XIII, 407
—— rationalistic, rejected, 407
—— confuted by archeologists, 412
—— what its upholders teach, 409
—— denies inspiration of the Bible, 407
—— rejects authenticity of the Bible, 408
Crusades, historical notice of, 299
—— their lawfulness, 301
—— their results, 303
Culture and the Catholic Church, 457

Doctrines, genuine Protestant, 245
—— cannot save any one, 246

Eddy, Mrs., the greatest religious fraud, 352
—— her sacrilegious interpretation of the Bible, 357
—— her sacrilegious interpretation of the Our Father, 357
Edict of Nantes, what it implies, 308
—— granted by Henry IV, 308
—— revoked by Louis XIV, 309
—— was its revocation expedient? 309
—— how was it executed, 311
—— what were its results, 312
Education, the Catholic Church and, 467
Effect, no, without its cause in Spiritism, 365

Faculties, all mental, subject to laws, 345
Faith, true, its several advantages, 244
Family, the, before the coming of Christ, 429
—— after the coming of Christ, 439
Freethinkers in proportion to their ignorance, 347
—— their silly charges against the Catholic Church, 349
Freethought, confuted by its definition, 345
—— leads to absurd results, 346

Galileo, historical notice on, 275
—— condemned by a Roman Congregation, 276
—— sentenced by a fallible tribunal, 277, 279
—— sentenced, not by any Pontifical definition, 278-287
—— failed to prove his position, 293
—— should have left the Bible alone, 283
—— no martyr to Science, 288
—— pensioned by Pope Urban VIII, 293
Gladiators, before the coming of Christ, 426
Gladiators suppressed by Christianity, 437
God, His existence accessible to reason, 343
Government, its Liberalism condemned, 188

Henry VIII of England, 56

Ignorance, invincible, excuses from guilt, 238, 242
—— culpable, cannot save, 241-244
Indefectibility, of the Church, defined, 133
—— its proof, 134
—— objection to, from Rabbis, solved, 136
Infallibility, of the Church, defined, 148
—— summary proofs, of, 148-150
—— how demonstrated, 150-155
—— promised and conferred by Christ, 156
—— its limit: Faith and Morals, 156
—— its organs or subjects, 161
—— Ecumenical councils, 162
—— the Supreme Roman Pontiff, 162-166
—— *Ex Cathedra* Definitions, 156
—— attacked and defended, 167-170
Inquisition, its general meaning, 254
—— date of Roman, 255
—— Spanish, more political than religious, 255-257
—— lawful in principle, 256-260
—— proceedings of the Roman, 262, 275
—— proceedings of the Spanish, 261, 267, 272
—— in England under Henry VIII, 271
—— in England under Elizabeth, 271
—— in Switzerland under Calvin, 271
Inspiration of Scripture, 48

Intolerance, doctrinal, condemned, 222
—— denounced but practiced by Protestants, 224, 228
—— civil and religious in Holland, 231, 298
—— civil and religious in England, 232-233
—— in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, 273, 299

Jurisdiction, Spiritual, 33
—— from whom received, 34
Jurisdictional Power, 36

Laws, English, against Catholics, 228
Leo XIII, denounces false Liberalism, 188-190
—— publishes Encyclical on Liberty, 208
Liberalism, wrong, if like Radicalism, 187, 192
Liberties, modern, meaning of, 193
—— are wrong in principle, 194
—— pernicious in consequences, 195-197
—— tolerated, not approved by the Church, 200-204
Liberty, 114, *vol. I*
—— Physical, 197, 209
—— moral, 114, *vol. I*, 198, 212, 214
—— political, 215
—— social or civil, 216
Luther, his apostasy, 55
—— his false doctrines, 55-56
—— sanctions bigamy, 53
—— violates his priestly and religious vows, 55

Marks of True Church, 16
—— of Unity of Doctrine, 17
—— of Government, 21-22
—— Sanctity, 25-27
—— Catholicity, 27-29
—— Apostolicity, 30-32
Massacre, the, of St. Bartholomew, 293
—— a strictly political crime, 294
Massacre, the, of St. Bartholomew, Catherine de Medici chief culprit, 296
—— religion had no part in, 294
—— why Gregory XIII ordered the *Te Deum*, 295
—— did Cardinal de Lorraine bless the daggers? 296
—— provocation to, from crimes of Huguenots, 297-298
Men most learned, why least free, 347
Modernism, the synthesis of all heresies, 391
—— its program, 392
—— based on false philosophy, 393
—— its 65 Propositions condemned, 398
—— summary of reasons for condemnation, 396
Mythic Rationalism confuted, 7

Obligation, general, to join the Church of Christ, 10
Orders, power of sacred, 33, 35
—— when and by whom conferred, 33
Oxford Theologians on Western Schism, 44-45

Party, liberal, in politics, legitimate, 186, 191, 206
Peter, St., First Bishop of Rome, 120-128
Pontifical Power, 37-38
Poor, the, and unfortunate, before the coming of Christ, 428
—— after His coming, 438
Popes, their powers in the Middle Ages, 313
—— why perfectly legitimate? 314, 317
—— then justified in deposing Rulers, 319-320
—— their action beneficial to society, 321
—— have there been many bad? 330-331
Power, spiritual, of the Church, independent, 173-175

Power, political of the State, independent, 175-176
—— temporal, of the Pope, 322
—— its perfect legitimacy, 322-328
Primacy of Peter and the Papacy, 109, 129
—— of honor, 109
—— of jurisdiction, 109
—— of directive authority, 109
—— its threefold power, 109
—— promised by Christ to Peter, 110-112
—— promise of, fulfilled, 114
—— transmitted to his legitimate successors, 116-119
—— asserted by first four General Councils, 124
Protestantism, possesses no marks of true Church, 54, 70
—— possesses no unity of doctrine, 57
—— possesses no unity of ministry or government, 61
—— possesses no unity of worship, 59
—— possesses no Holiness, 62
—— possesses no Catholicity, 67
—— possesses no Apostolicity, 68
—— its endless sects result of Freethought, 348
Protestants, on what conditions they can be saved, 242-244
—— their own doctrines cannot save them, 245

Rights of the Church, 177
—— when they should prevail, 178-180
Roman Catholic Church, 13
—— possesses unity of doctrine, 38
—— possesses unity of ministry, 41
—— possesses Sanctity, 47, 49
—— possesses Catholicity, 49-50
—— possesses Apostolicity, 50-52
—— Apostolicity not broken by Western Schism, 42-45
Rule of Faith, Catholic, 73
Rule of Faith, of Church of England, fallacious, 79
—— Protestant, 72
—— Protestant, against teaching of Christ, 73
—— Protestant, against the Bible, 74, 75, 77
—— Protestant, against tradition and history of the Church, 76
Russian Church, when won over to Schism, 94
—— the present disruption of, 104-107

Sacramental power, 36, 37
Salvation, no, out of the Church, 236
—— true meaning of this maxim, 237
—— what Church is here meant, 237, 238
Schism of the West (1378-1417), 42-45
—— chief authors of the Schism, 91, 92
—— did not break Apostolicity of the Church, 45-46
Schismatic, Oriental, Church, 90
—— how it originated, 90, 92
—— how divided, 93
—— possesses no marks of true Church, 89
—— possesses no unity of belief, 96
—— possesses no unity of ministry, 98
—— possesses no Sanctity, 99
—— possesses no Catholicity, 100
—— possesses no Apostolicity, 102
Science and the Catholic Church, 479
Scriptures, holy, reading of, 84
—— Catholic versions of, 86, 87
—— which versions forbidden, 48
Slavery, before the coming of Christ, 424
—— gradually suppressed by the Church, 435
Society, the Church a true, 6-8
—— perfect, complete, 12

Society, civil, before the coming of Christ, 430
—— condition of, after His coming, 440
Soviet Russian Government, antichristian, 108
Spiritism, what it is, 361
—— its astounding feats, 362
—— many of them real facts, 363
—— are its marvels from God?, 366
—— from the good Angels?, 367
—— are they the work of mediums?, 368
—— the effects of unknown causes?, 369
—— must they be attributed to the souls of the dead?, 371
—— they are the work of demons, 374
—— wrongly admits future probations, 373
—— cause of much serious harm, 378
—— destructive of Christianity, 379
State, civil, what it owes to the Church, 181-185
Syllabus of errors held by Modernists, 398

Theosophy, its organizers in the United States, 384
—— its purpose, 384
—— its glaring errors, 385
—— its illusive promises, 386
—— destructive of Christian truths, 386
—— some of its astounding marvels, 388
—— the work of advanced Theosophists?, 389
—— due to discovery of hidden natural law?, 388
Theosophy, against Christianity, 388
—— its marvels the work of demons, 389
—— rightly condemned by the Catholic Church, 390
Tolerance, doctrinal, rejected, 200
—— civil, permitted, 200, 204
—— its modifications, 206
Toleration, religious and civil in Maryland, 230
—— Puritans against it, 231
Transubstantiation, array of proof of, 334
Truth, unchangeable, against Freethought, 349
—— reached by observation and testimony, 342

United Greek Catholic Church, 89
Universities and the Popes, 482
Usefulness of good works denied by Luther, 64
—— and by Calvin, 65

Vicious circle, wrongly attributed to Catholics, 246
—— charge of, repelled, 246-249

Wars of Religion caused by heretics, 306
—— against the Church and the State, 306-307
Will, free, rejected by Luther, 64
—— and by Calvin, 64
Woman, rehabilitated and honored by Christianity, 439
—— before the coming of Christ, 429
World, Roman, before the coming of Christ, 421
—— after His coming, 433
Working classes, uplifted by Christianity, 439

INDEX OF WRITERS QUOTED IN THIS WORK

(*The figures refer to volume and page.*)

Agassiz, I, 56, 280, 300
Aiken, Dr., I, 533
Allain, II, 470, 473
Ammian Marcellinus, I, 452
Anglican minister, II, 98
Arayo, I, 19
Aristotle, I, 16
Association, British, I, 239
Augustine, St., I, 206, II, 33.

Bacon, Lord, I, 28
Bacon, Roger, II, 484
Balmes, II, 260, 270, 431.
Baltimore, Lord, II, 230
Baluffi, Card., I, 455; II, 478
Bampton, S.J., II, 397
Bancroft, George, II, 230
Bellarmine, Card. Bl., II, 4, 278
Bellwald, S. M., II, 359
Benedict XIV, II, 257
Bianchi, II, 318
Biblical Commission, I, 277, 369
Bishop, Anglican, II, 451
Blavatsky, H. P., II, 386
Blunt, II, 86
Boedder, I, 80, 91
Boetius, I, 98
Bolingbroke, I, 172
Bolsec, II, 70
Boppert, II, 334
Bossuet, I, 59, 453; II, 113, 489
Boulanger, I, 256, 439
Bourdaloue, I, 206
Bright, Canon, II, 167
Broeckaert, II, 172, 302
Broglie, de, I, 341
Brownson, Orestes, I, 240; II, 246, 349, 453
Brunetière, I, 8
Bruyère, La, I, 20, 21
Buckley, Dr., II, 355
Budkiewiez, Mgr., II, 101
Buffon, Comte de, I, 285
Bus elli, II, 385

Cabanis, I, 154
Caligula, II, 427
Carpenter, Prof., I, 240
Carrington, Dr., II, 375
Cathrein, I, 15, 171
Cato, II, 425
Caussette, Abbé, I, 293
Celsus, I, 231, 343
Challis, II, 364
Chateaubriand II, 424
Chatterton, Thomas, II, 351
Christie, II, 273
Clarke, R., II, 363
Claude B., I, 36
Clausius, I, 275
Clavius, C., II, 462
Coler, Bird, II, 296.
Congregation, Roman, II, 291
Copernicus, II, 280
Cobbett, William, II, 228, 271, 273
Chillingworth, II, 72
Champollion, Jr., I, 327, 333
Crookes, Sir W., II, 362, 368
Chrysostom, St. John, I, 84

Damascene, St. John, I, 85
Damiron, I, 84
Dante, I, 162, 429, 552
Darras, I, 337; II, 42, 43
Darwin, I, 285, 299, 302
Davidson, S., Dr., II, 409
De Medici, Catherine, II, 297
Demosthenes, I, 12
Deschamps, Card., II, 237
De Smedt, II, 444

Devos, Julius, I, 460
Diagoras, I, 12
Donckt, van der, II, 351
Doyle, Conan, II, 366
Dublin Review, II, 395
Draper, II, 482
Durny, Albert, II, 476

Eddy, Mrs., II, 359
Edison, Thomas, I, 125
Elain, Chas, M.D., I, 34, 280
Elizabeth, of England, II, 271, 319
Encyclopedia Britannica, I, 147; II, 277
Encyclopedia, Catholic, I, 138
Encyclopedia, International, II, 142
England, Bishop, II, 247
Epinois, M. de l', II, 289
Euler, I, 383

Fairbairn, Dr., I, 144
Faraday, I, 18
Faye, H., I, 57
Ferdinand, King (Spain), II, 255
Fichte, I, 79
Fitzwilliam, II, 228
Flammarion, Astronomer, II, 374
Flavius Josephus, I, 233, 236, 451
Flint, Dr. Austin, II, 355
Flourens, I, 268, 307
Flügel, I, 15, 171
Freppel, Bishop, I, 244; II, 461
Fustel, M. de Coulanges, II, 431, 432

Galien, I, 56
Galileo, II, 275, 279, 283, 288
Gamaliel, Jewish Doctor, II, 380
Gaume, Mgr., I, 486
Gebber, Karl, II, 291
Ghilardi, L. Lilio, II, 462
Gibbon, historian, I, 462; II, 323
Gibbons, Card., I, 125
Gigot, S. S., II, 250
Gladstone, II, 486
Gonzales, Card., I, 258
Gousset, Mgr., II, 318
Gregory, Nazianzen, St., I, 89
Guillot, I, 23
Guizot, historian, II, 321, 459

Haeckel, I, 267
Hallam, II, 232
Harlez, Mgr. de, I, 532
Harnack, Adolph, II, 410
Hastings, H. S., I, 351
Hatch, Dr., II, 382
Hegel, I, 79
Heine, I, 154
Helmholtz, I, 58
Henry IV (of France) II, 308
Herbigny, d', S.J., II, 107
Hergenröther, Card., II, 36, 315
Herodotus, I, 9
Herschel, John F., II, 362
Herzen, I, 113, 118
Hettinger, Franz, I, 11, 351
Hitchcock, C. H., I, 47, 272
Höffding, H., I, 139
Holaind, I, 6, 129
Holland, Dr., I, 72
Homer, I, 9
Honorius Ist, II, 168
Horton, R., II, 251
House, I, 479
Hugo, Victor, II, 467
Huguenots, II, 310
Humboldt, I, 33
Humphrey, W., S.J., I, 221
Hurter, historian, II, 321
Hurter, S.J., II, 486
Huxley, Thomas, I, 47, 283, 284

Innocent XI, II, 164
Irenæus, St., II, 32
Isabella, Queen (Spain), II, 255

Janssen, J., I, 53
Jerome, Doctor, St., I, 85
Jones, Rev., II, 79
Jordan, Dr. Starr, I, 72
Jouffroy, II, 469
Jouin, S.J., I, 347
Joyce, G. H., S.J., I, 198
Julian, the Apostate, I, 231
Jurieu, II, 19
Justin, Martyr, St., I, 223

Kant, Immanuel, I, 148; II, 393
Kardec, Allan (Rivail) II, 372
Kellog, V., I, 299
Kelvin, Lord, I, 273

Kepler, I, 53, 56, 242; II, 280, 282
Kerroux, II, 231
Kervyn, II, 294, 297
Kinns, Samuel, I, 17
Knabenbauer, I, 15, 171
Krauss, Dr., I, 13

Laboulaye, II, 433
Lacordaire, O.P., I, 441
Lancaster, Sir, I, 240
Laplace, I, 385
Lapparent, I, 35, 254, 267
Lasserre, Henri, I, 432
Lecky, II, 232
Leibnitz, I, 131
Leighton, Dr., I, 240
Leo XIII, I, 366; II, 69, 170, 407, 419
Lerius, Vincent, St., II, 41, 76
Lessius, Leonard, S.J., I, 45
Liberius (Pope) II, 167, 169
Liddon, Canon, II, 167
Lindsay, II, 129
Linnæus, I, 56
Littledale, Dr., II, 298
Littrè, I, 20
Livingstone, I, 9, 293
Llorente, II, 264, 270
Lodge, Sir Oliver, II, 366
Logue, Card., II, 414
Loisy, Alfred, II, 407
Longfellow, II, 455
Lorimer, Dr., I, 263
Louis XIV (of France), II, 311
Luther, II, 224
Lyons, Rev. D., II, 148

Mabillon, O.S.B., I, 259
Macaulay, II, 489
McCabe, Joseph, I, 71, 73
McErlane, S.J., I, 467
Mahomet, I, 464
Maistre, Joseph de, I, 82, 557; II, 274
Maitland, II, 88, 485
Mallock, I, 263
Manning, Card., I, 287; II, 327
Marshall, F. W. M., I, 53; II, 67
Martin, S., I, 196
Maudsley, Dr., I, 144
Maury, Captain, U.S.N., I, 54
Micklem, E. H., II, 409
Mill, Stewart, I, 148
Miller, Hugh, I, 266
Mivart, St. George, I, 278, 299
Moigno, Abbé, I, 447
Moleschott, I, 42
Molloy, G., D.D., I, 253
Monsabré, O.P., I, 14
Montesquieu, II, 307
Morris, Dr., I, 402
Morton, I, 307
Motley, II, 466
Moulart, II, 315
Müller, II, 293
Müller, Max, I, 11
Muzzarelli, Rev., II, 240

Napoleon I, I, 56; II, 324
Naville, E., I, 17, 36; II, 489
Nero, Emperor, I, 472
Newman, Card., I, 146, 294
Newton, Isaac, I, 385
Nicolas, Augustus, I, 20; II, 448

Olivier, S.J., I, 21, 466; II, 117
Origen, I, 84
Ovid, I, 131
Oxford Theologians, II, 44

Palmer, William, II, 106
Paschal, Baylon, St., I, 103
Pasteur, Louis, I, 17, 268, 270
Pastor Ludwig, Dr., II, 118
Peabody, F. W., II, 352
Peter Lombard, I, 16
Pettigrew, M.D., I, 279, 280
Pfaff, I, 252
Pie, Card., I, 374; II, 304
Pirenne, Abbé, II, 460
Pius VI, II, 164
Pius IX, I, 80, 198, 204; II, 161, 238, 395
Pius X, II, 391, 394
Plato, I, 9, 14, 97, 169
Plautus, II, 428
Pliny, the younger, I, 458, 477
Plutarch, I, 9, 14, 16
Pope (poet) I, 70; II, 250
Porphyrius, I, 231, 343
Possidius (historian), II, 442
Pouchet, I, 270

Poullet, M., II, 266
Prescott, II, 466
Prius, I, 113, 121, 181
Proctor, II, 279
Proudhon, I, 20
Ptolemaic Astronomy, II, 285

Quatrefages, de, I, 13, 28, 32, 268, 292
Quintilian, I, 16

Rationalist Press, I, 70
Raymond, Xavier, I, 322
Reis, W.C., I, 54
Redi, I, 268
Review, Ecclesiastical, I, 402
Review, Fortnightly (Preuss), I, 405; II, 126
Richard of St. Victor, I, 354
Rickert, Dr., II, 368
Robespierre, I, 12
Rousseau, J. J., I, 169, 540; II, 223
Russo, S.J., I, 212; II, 244
Ryan, Archbishop, I, 28

Sainte-Beuve, I, 20
Sayce, Rev. A. H., II, 412
Schelling, I, 10, 79
Scherer, E., I, 169
Schopenhauer, I, 8
Schouppe, S.J., II, 207, 279, 325
Seneca, I, 16, 172; II, 424, 428
Simon, Jules, I, 12
Sixtus IV, II, 255, 261, 268
Socrates, I, 14
Sophocles, I, 9
Southall, James C., I, 317, 324, 332
Spencer, Herbert, I, 148
Spinoza, I, 79
Stainton, Moses, II, 375
Stock, S. G., II, 379
Stokes, G. G., Sir, I, 71
Strickland (Miss), II, 232
Suarez, Fr. S.J., II, 36
Suetonius, I, 439
Sully-Prudhomme, I, 115

Tabrum, I, 71, 239
Tacitus, I, 439, 472
Taine, II, 476
Tait, Prof., I, 273
Talmage, De Witt, II, 367
Taparelli, S.J., I, 145
Tertullian, I, 16, 22, 458, 478
Thiers, II, 324
Thomas Aquinas, St., I, 22, 44, 62, 90, 141, 195, 206
Thurston, S.J., II, 363
Tiele, I, 260
Times, London, I, 300
Tiraboschi, S.J., II, 280
Trajan, Emperor, I, 477
Tricht, van, S.J., I, 18
Tylor, I, 11
Tyndall, I, 33, 144, 280, 299

Urquhart, II, 321
Urráburu, John, S.J., I, 168

Vatican Council, I, 30, 204, 301
Vaughan, J. S. Bishop, I, 1, 45, 64, 106, 285; II, 451
Vienne, Council of, I, 149
Vigilius (Pope), II, 167
Virchow, S., I, 38, 258, 268, 272, 282
Virgil, Maro, I, 9, 73
Vogt, Karl, I, 42, 285
Voigt, II, 321
Voltaire, I, 32, 68, 439; II, 474

Wagner, I, 307
Wainwright, S., I, 33
Waitz, I, 10
Wallace, I, 273
Wallon, I, 355
Warburton, I, 453
Watts, Dr., II, 247, 249
Weninger, F., S.J., II, 244
Winslow, Forbes, Dr., II, 381
Wiseman, Card., I, 345; II, 480
Woodlock, S.J., II, 344, 347
Wright, Dr. Thomas, I, 279
Wyville, Thompson, I, 278

Xavier, Francis, St., I, 408
Xenophon, I, 14, 15

DATE DUE

JUL 10 1995			
JUL 14 995			
JAN 0 6 2014			
AUG 2 0 2014			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.

BX
1751
D55
1924
v.2
GTU

Devivier, Walter,

Christian
apologetics;

Graduate Theological Union
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709

DEMCO

GTU Library
BX1751 .D55 1924 v.2 G
Devivier, Walter/Christian apologetics;
3 2400 00032 6177